arXiv:1009.3680v3 [math.AG] 17 Aug 2012

Zeta Functions for Non-degenerate Laurent Polynomials in Two Variables Over p-adic Fields

E. León-Cardenal and W. A. Zúñiga-Galindo

Abstract. We study local zeta functions for non-degenerate Laurent polynomials in two variables over p-adic fields. The main result establishes the existence of asymptotic expansions for exponential sums mod p^m, or more generally, for p-adic oscillatory integrals attached to Laurent polynomials. We show the existence of two different asymptotic expansions: one when the absolute value of the parameter approaches infinity, the other when the absolute value of the parameter approaches zero. These two asymptotic expansions are controlled by the poles of twisted local zeta functions.

1. Introduction

In this article, we study local zeta functions for non-degenerate Laurent polynomials (in two variables) with respect to its Newton polytope at infinity over p-adic fields. By using toroidal compactifications, we show the existence of a meromorphic continuation for these zeta functions as rational functions of q^{-s}. In contrast with classical Igusa's zeta functions, the meromorphic continuation of zeta functions for Laurent polynomials have poles with positive and negative real parts. We also extend Igusa's stationary phase method to oscillatory integrals (and exponential sums) depending on a p-adic parameter to the case of Laurent polynomials in two variables. Here a new and interesting phenomenon occurs, the oscillatory integrals admit two different types of asymptotic expansions: one when the p-adic absolute value of the parameter tends to infinity and other when the p-adic absolute value of the parameter tends to zero. There are another important differences with the classical case initially studied by Varchenko in the Archimedean setting, see e.g. [**5**], [**6**], [**9**], [**19**], [**26**], [**28**], [**31**], [**32**]. The first one is that the convergence of the integral defining the local zeta function is not a straight forward matter due to presence of 'denominators.' The second one is that Newton polygon at origin is not involved here at all, while it plays an important role in the study of local zeta functions for non-degenerate polynomials in the variables (x_1, x_2).

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 14G10, 11S40; Secondary 11T23, 14M25.

Key words and phrases. exponential sums mod p^m, p-adic oscillatory integrals, Laurent polynomials, Igusa zeta function, Newton polytopes, non-degeneracy conditions at infinity.

The second author was partially supported by Conacyt (Mexico), Grant # 127794.

We now discuss in detail our motivations and results. In [**1**]-[**2**] Adolphson and Sperber and in [**7**] Denef and Loeser provided sharp estimates for exponential sums of type $\sum_{x\in V(\mathbb{F}_q)}\psi(f(x))$ with $V(\mathbb{F}_q)=(\mathbb{F}_q^{\times})^r\times\mathbb{F}_q^{n-r}$, and $f\in\mathbb{F}_q[x_1,\cdots,x_n,x_1^{-1},\cdots,x_n^{-1}]$ a Laurent polynomial which is non-degenerate with respect to its Newton polytope at infinity. Our first motivation was to study the asymptotic behavior of these exponential sums in a p-adic setting, or more generally p-adic oscillatory integrals attached to Laurent polynomials in two variables which are non-degenerate with respect to its Newton polytope at infinity, see Definition 1 and [**17**]-[**18**]. The results presented here constitutes an extension of Igusa's method for estimating exponential sums mod p^m, see [**13**]-[**14**] and [**4**], to the case of non-degenerate Laurent polynomials in two variables. The simplest type of a such exponential sum is

$$S_m=\sum_{x\in(\mathbb{Z}^{\times}/p^m\mathbb{Z})\times(\mathbb{Z}/p^m\mathbb{Z})}e^{\frac{2\pi i}{p^m}\left(\frac{h(x_1,x_2)}{x_1}\right)},$$

with $m\in\mathbb{N}$, and $\frac{h(x_1,x_2)}{x_1}$ non–degenerate with respect to its Newton polytope at infinity, see Corollary 1. Denote by Ψ a fixed additive character of $\mathbb{Q}_p$, see Section 4.1, and take $f(x_1,x_2)\in\mathbb{Q}_p\left[x_1,x_2,x_1^{-1},x_2^{-1}\right]$ non–degenerate at infinity. The above exponential sums are a particular case of the following type of oscillatory integrals:

$$E_{\Phi}^{(1)}(z,f)=\int\limits_{\left(\mathbb{Q}_p^{\times}\right)^2}\Phi(x_1,x_2)\,\Psi(zf(x_1,x_2))\,|dx_1dx_2|\,,$$

where Φ is a locally constant function with compact support in $\mathbb{Z}_p^2$, and $z=up^{-m}$, with $u\in\mathbb{Z}_p^{\times}$, and $m\in\mathbb{Z}$. It is important to mention, that for general f, $E_{\Phi}^{(1)}(z,f)$ cannot be expressed as a linear combination of exponential sums mod p^m.

Our main result asserts that $E_{\Phi}^{(1)}(z,f)$ has an asymptotic expansion of type

$$\textstyle\sum_{\lambda}c_{\lambda}\chi(ac\ z)\,|z|_p^{\lambda}\left(\log_p|z|_p\right)^{j_{\lambda}}\ \text{as}\ \ |z|_p\rightarrow\infty,$$

where λ runs through the 'real negative parts' of the poles of all the twisted local zeta functions attached to f, and that $E_{\Phi}^{(1)}(z,f)$ has an asymptotic expansion of type

$$\int_{\left(\mathbb{Q}_p^{\times}\right)^2}\Phi(x_1,x_2)\,|dx_1dx_2|+\textstyle\sum_{\lambda}c_{\lambda}\chi(ac\ z)\,|z|_p^{\lambda}\left(\log_p|z|_p\right)^{j_{\lambda}}\ \text{as}\ \ |z|_p\rightarrow 0,$$

where λ runs through the 'real positive parts' of the poles of all the twisted local zeta functions attached to f, see Theorem 5. If f is a polynomial in (x_1,x_2), the first type of asymptotic expansion is well-known in the Archimedean and non-Archimedean contexts, see e.g. [**3**], [**4**], [**13**], [**14**], [**20**], [**26**], [**31**], [**32**]. The second type of asymptotic expansion is new, as far as we know, and the existence of such asymptotic expansion is a consequence of the fact that twisted local zeta functions have poles with positive real parts which in turn is a consequence of the fact that Laurent polynomials, considered as rational functions, may have poles on the coordinate axes. We also obtain asymptotic expansions for

$$V_m(f,\Phi):=vol\left(\left\{x\in\operatorname{supp}(\Phi)\cap\left(\mathbb{Q}_p^{\times}\right)^2;\,|f(x)|_p=p^{-m}\right\}\right)\tag{1.1}$$

when $m\rightarrow\pm\infty$, see Theorem 4.

The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2, we review some basic results on toric manifolds, toric compactifications, toric resolution of singularities for Laurent polynomials over a local field of characteristic zero, following Khovanskii [**17**]-[**18**] and Varchenko [**26**]-[**27**]. In Section 3, we establish the meromorphic continuation of twisted local zeta functions attached to non-degenerate Laurent polynomials, and give a description of the possible poles, see Theorem 1, 2, 3, Propositions 2-3. To handle the problem of the convergence of local zeta functions we introduce the 'p-adic quadrants,' and attach a local zeta function to each quadrant. As an application, we obtain asymptotic expansions for (1.1), see Theorem 4. In Section 4, we prove the existence of asymptotic expansions for oscillatory integrals, see Theorem 5, and in Section 5, we give an explicit formula for local zeta functions supported on the first quadrant valid for almost all p.

2. Newton Polytopes, Non-degeneracy Conditions and Toric Manifolds

In this section, we review some basic results on toric manifolds, toric compactifications and resolution of singularities of Laurent polynomials over a local field of characteristic zero. The results needed here are variations of the ones given in [**17**]-[**18**], [**26**]-[**27**] or [**21**] in the Archimedean setting. The material needed to adapt these results to the p-adic setting can be found in [**14**], [**23**].

2.1. Newton Polytopes. We set $\mathbb{R}_+ := \{x \in \mathbb{R}; x \geqslant 0\}$. Let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denote the usual inner product of $\mathbb{R}^2$, and identify the dual space of $\mathbb{R}^2$ with $\mathbb{R}^2$ itself by means of it.

Let K be a local field of characteristic zero. Let

$$f(x_1, x_2) = \sum_l c_l x^l \in K\left[x_1, x_2, x_1^{-1}, x_2^{-1}\right]$$

be a non-constant Laurent polynomial. Set $supp(f) := \left\{l \in \mathbb{Z}^2; c_l \neq 0\right\}$. We define *the Newton polytope* $\Gamma_\infty(f) := \Gamma_\infty$ *of* f *at infinity* as the convex hull of $supp(f)$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Note that, if $supp(f) = \{l_1, \cdots, l_r\}$, then

$$\Gamma_\infty = conv\left(l_1, \cdots, l_r\right) = \left\{\sum_{i=1}^{r} \lambda_i l_i; \lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_r \in \mathbb{R}_+, \sum_{i=1}^{r} \lambda_i = 1\right\}.$$

In combinatorics a set like Γ_∞ is typically called a *rational (or lattice) polytope (i.e. a compact polyhedron).* From now on, we will use just *polytope* to mean *rational polytope* and *assume that* $\dim \Gamma_\infty = 2$.

2.1.1. *Faces.* Let H be the plane $\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^2; \langle a, x\rangle = b\right\}$. Then H determines two closed half-spaces:

$$H^+ := \left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^2; \langle a, x\rangle \geq b\right\}$$

and

$$H^- := \left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^2; \langle a, x\rangle \leq b\right\}.$$

We say that H is *a supporting plane* of Γ_∞, if $\Gamma_\infty \cap H \neq \emptyset$ and Γ_∞ is contained in one of the closed half-spaces determined by H. A *face* of Γ_∞ is the intersection of Γ_∞ with a supporting plane.

The *dimension of a face* τ of Γ_∞ is the dimension of its affine span, and its *codimension* is $cod(\tau) = 2 - \dim(\tau)$. Faces of dimension 0 and 1 are called *vertices* and *facets* respectively. We denote by $Vert(\Gamma_\infty)$ the set of vertices of Γ_∞. For further details the reader may consult [**22**], [**24**], [**30**, Chapter 7].

Given $a \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we define

$$d(a) = \inf \left\{ \langle a, x \rangle ; x \in \Gamma_\infty \right\}. \tag{2.1}$$

Note, that since a convex polytope is the convex hull of its vertices, in (2.1) we can take the infimum as x varies in $Vert(\Gamma_\infty)$, which is a finite set, i.e.

$$d(a) = \min \left\{ \langle a, x \rangle ; x \in Vert(\Gamma_\infty) \right\},$$

and $d(a) = \langle a, x_0 \rangle$ for some $x_0 \in Vert(\Gamma_\infty)$.

Note that for a given supporting plane H of Γ_∞ there exists a unique perpendicular vector a, which satisfies $H^+ \cap \Gamma_\infty \neq \emptyset$. This vector is called the *inward* normal to H. A vector $a = (a_1, a_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is called primitive if $g.c.d.(a_1, a_2) = 1$.

Let τ be a facet of Γ_∞, and H a supporting plane for Γ_∞ such that $\tau = H^+ \cap \Gamma_\infty$. Then $\tau = conv(l_1, \ldots, l_s)$, with $l_i \in supp(f)$. The affine span of τ is a straight line satisfying an equation of type $a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 - d = 0$; $a_1, a_2, d \in \mathbb{Z}$. We now pick a_1, a_2 satisfying $g.c.d.(a_1, a_2) = 1$, then $(a_1, a_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ is the normal primitive inward vector to H. We denote the set of all these vectors as $\mathfrak{D}\left(\Gamma_\infty\right)$.

2.2. Cones and Fans. We now review the construction of a polyhedral subdivision of $\mathbb{R}^2$ *subordinated to* Γ_∞. Such construction is well-known, see e.g. [**10**], [**11**, p. 26-27], [**25**, Chapter 2], [**30**, Chapter 7], we also use [**6**], [**26**], for this reason we do not give proofs.

A subset $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ is called *a convex cone* if it is a convex subset which is closed under positive scalar multiplication. A cone Δ is called *pointed* if it contains the origin. All the cones considered in this article will be pointed. A cone Δ is said to be *spanned by* $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^2$ if $\Delta = \{\lambda_1 a + \lambda_2 b; \lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}_+\}$. If a, b are linearly independent over $\mathbb{R}$, Δ is called a *simplicial cone.* If $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, we say Δ is a *rational cone.* If $\det \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix} = \pm 1$, we call Δ a *simple cone.*

We define *the first meet locus* of $a \in \mathbb{R}^2$ as

$$F(a) = \{x \in \Gamma_\infty; \langle a, x \rangle = d\left(a\right)\}.$$

Note that $F(a)$ is a face of Γ_∞, and that $F(0) = \Gamma_\infty$.

We define an equivalence relation on $\mathbb{R}^2$ by taking

$$a \sim a' \Longleftrightarrow F\left(a\right) = F\left(a'\right).$$

It is known that every proper face τ of Γ_∞ is contained in some facet of Γ_∞, and that τ is the finite intersection of all the facets of Γ_∞ that contain τ.

If τ is a face of Γ_∞, we define *the cone associated to* τ as

$$\Delta_\tau = \left\{a \in \mathbb{R}^2; F\left(a\right) = \tau\right\}.$$

The equivalence classes of $\sim$ are precisely the cones Δ_τ. The following results will be used later on.

Lemma 1. *Let τ be a proper face of Γ_∞. The the following assertions hold.*
(i) Δ_τ is an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^2$.
(ii) The topological closure $\overline{\Delta}_\tau$ of Δ_τ is a rational polyhedral cone and

$$\overline{\Delta}_\tau = \left\{a \in \mathbb{R}^2; F\left(a\right) \supset \tau\right\}.$$

(iii) The function $d\left(\cdot\right)$ is linear on $\overline{\Delta}_\tau$.

We recall that a *fan* $\mathcal{F}$ is a finite collection of cones $\{\Delta_i ; i \in I\}$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$ such that: (i) if $\Delta_i \in \mathcal{F}$ and Δ is a face of Δ_i, then $\Delta \in \mathcal{F}$; (ii) if Δ_1, $\Delta_2 \in \mathcal{F}$, then $\Delta_1 \cap \Delta_2$ is a face of Δ_1 and Δ_2. The *support* of $\mathcal{F}$ is $|\mathcal{F}| := \cup_{i \in I} \Delta_i$. A fan $\mathcal{F}$ is called *simplicial* (resp. *simple*) if all its cones are simplicial (resp. simple). A fan $\mathcal{F}$ is called *subordinated to* Γ_∞, if every cone in $\mathcal{F}$ is contained in an equivalence class of $\sim$. We denote by *edges*$(\mathcal{F})$, the set of all edges (generators) of the cones in $\mathcal{F}$.

Lemma 2. *The closures* $\overline{\Delta}_\tau$ *of the cones associated to the faces of* Γ_∞ *form a simplicial fan* $\mathcal{F}_0$ *subordinated to* Γ_∞. *Moreover, we have the following:*
(i) Let τ *be a proper face of* Γ_∞. *Then the map*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \{\textit{faces of } \Gamma_\infty \textit{ that contain } \tau\} & \to & \left\{\textit{non-empty faces of } \overline{\Delta}_\tau\right\} \\ & & \\ \sigma & \to & \overline{\Delta}_\sigma \end{array}$$

is one-to-one and onto.
(ii) Let τ_1, τ_2 *be a faces of* Γ_∞. *Suppose that* τ_1 *is a facet of* τ_2, *i.e.* τ_1 *has codimension one in* τ_2, *then* $\overline{\Delta}_{\tau_2}$ *is facet of* $\overline{\Delta}_{\tau_1}$.

Lemma 3. *(i) Let* τ *be a proper face of* Γ_∞. *Let* γ_1, γ_r, $r = 1$ *or* 2, *be the facets of* Γ_∞ *containing* τ. *Let* $a_1, a_r \in \mathbb{Z}^n \smallsetminus \{0\}$ *be the unique primitive perpendicular inward vectors to* γ_1, γ_r *respectively. Then*

$$\overline{\Delta}_\tau = \{\lambda_1 a_1 + \lambda_r a_r ; \lambda_1, \lambda_r \in \mathbb{R}_+\} \textit{ and } \Delta_\tau = \{\lambda_1 a_1 + \lambda_r a_r ; \lambda_1, \lambda_r \in \mathbb{R}_+ \setminus \{0\}\}.$$

(ii) $\dim \Delta_\tau = \dim \overline{\Delta}_\tau = 2 - \dim \tau$.

2.3. Fans supported on $\mathbb{R}^2_+$. We now construct a fan subordinated to Γ_∞ and supported on $\mathbb{R}^2_+$. This fan will be used later on.

Consider the family $\left\{\mathbb{R}^2_+ \cap \Delta_\tau\right\}_\tau$, with $\mathbb{R}^2_+ \cap \Delta_\tau \neq \varnothing$ and τ running over the proper faces of Γ_∞. We say that a proper face $\tau \subset \Gamma_\infty$ is *an attainable face* if $\mathbb{R}^2_+ \cap \Delta_\tau \neq \varnothing$. We denote by $\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{A}(\Gamma_\infty)$ the set of attainable faces of Γ_∞.We warn the reader that our notion of 'attainable face' is not necessarily equivalent to the corresponding notion in [**18**]. Then $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}} := \left\{\overline{\mathbb{R}^2_+ \cap \Delta_\tau}\right\}_{\tau \in \mathcal{A}}$ is a simplicial fan subordinated to Γ_∞. This assertion is valid only in dimension two for arbitrary f. It is not difficult to find in dimension 3 examples showing that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is not necessarily a fan subordinated to Γ_∞.

Let $\{e_1, e_2\}$ be the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^2$. The set *edges*$(\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}})$ can be partitioned as $\mathfrak{D}(\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}) \cup \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}})$, where $\mathfrak{D}(\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}) \subset \mathfrak{D}(\Gamma_\infty)$ and $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}) \subseteq \{e_1, e_2\}$. The vectors e_1, e_2 are not necessarily perpendicular to some facets of Γ_∞.

By adding new rays each simplicial cone in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}$ can be partitioned further into a finite number of simple cones. In this way we obtain a *simple fan* $\mathcal{F}_+$ *subordinated to* Γ_∞, see e.g. [**16**]. Note that the set of edges of the cones in $\mathcal{F}_+$ can be partitioned as $\mathfrak{D}(\mathcal{F}_+) \cup \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F}_+) \cup \mathcal{E}'(\mathcal{F}_+)$, where $\mathfrak{D}(\mathcal{F}_+) \subset \mathfrak{D}(\Gamma_\infty)$, $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F}_+) \subseteq \{e_1, e_2\}$ and $\mathcal{E}'(\mathcal{F}_+)$ is a finite set of primitive vectors corresponding to the extra rays induced by the subdivision into simple cones.

The family $\left\{\mathbb{R}^2_+ \cap \Delta_\tau\right\}_{\tau \in \mathcal{A}}$ is a partition of $\mathbb{R}^2_+ \backslash \{0\}$, we will call this family a *simplicial polyhedral subdivision of* $\mathbb{R}^2_+ \backslash \{0\}$ *subordinated to* Γ_∞. By adding new rays as before, we obtain a *simple polyhedral subdivision of* $\mathbb{R}^2_+ \backslash \{0\}$ *subordinated to* Γ_∞.

Example 1. *Set* $f(x,y)=x^{-3}+y^2+y^4$. *The facets of* $\Gamma_\infty(f)$ *are the following:*

$$\tau_1=\left\{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathbb{R}^2;4\alpha-3\beta=-12,\ -3\leq\alpha\leq0\right\},$$

$$\tau_2=\left\{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathbb{R}^2;\alpha=0,\ 2\leq\beta\leq4\right\},$$

$$\tau_3=\left\{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathbb{R}^2;-2\alpha+3\beta=6,\ -3\leq\alpha\leq0\right\},$$

and $\mathcal{D}(\Gamma_\infty)=\{(-2,3),(-1,0),(4,-3)\}$. *By using the above construction we get that the fan* $\mathcal{F}_+$ *(supported on* $\mathbb{R}_+^2$*) is the first quadrant of* $\mathbb{R}^2$, *since for* $\gamma=(-3,0)$, *we have* $\overline{\Delta}_\gamma=(-2,3)\mathbb{R}_+^2+(4,-3)\mathbb{R}_+^2\supset\mathbb{R}_+^2$.

Remark 1. *Let* $\mathcal{F}_0$ *be as in Lemma 2. We will say that* $\mathcal{F}_0$ *is trivial, if there exists a vertex* γ_0 *of* Γ_∞ *such that* $\mathbb{R}_+^2\subseteq\overline{\Delta}_{\gamma_0}$. *If* $\mathcal{F}_0$ *is trivial, then edges*$(\mathcal{F}_0)=\{e_1,e_2\}$. *By introducing the ray* $(1,1)\in\mathbb{R}_+^2$, *we get a nontrivial and simple fan* $\mathcal{F}_+$ *subordinated to* Γ_∞.

2.4. Khovanskii Non-degeneracy Condition. Given a face τ of Γ_∞, we define *the face function of* f *with respect to* τ as $f_\tau(x)=\sum_{l\in\tau}c_lx^l$. We set $T^2=T^2(K):=\left\{(x_1,x_2)\in K^2;x_1\cdot x_2\neq0\right\}$, for the 2-dimensional torus considered as a K-analytic manifold.

Definition 1. *Let* $f(x)=\sum_l c_lx^l\in K\left[x_1,x_2,x_1^{-1},x_2^{-1}\right]$ *be a non-constant Laurent polynomial with Newton polytope* Γ_∞. *We say that* f *is non-degenerate with respect to* Γ_∞ *over* K, *if for every face* τ *of* Γ_∞, *including* Γ_∞ *itself, the system of equations* $\{f_\tau(x)=0,\nabla f_\tau(x)=0\}$ *has no solutions in* $T^2(K)$.

Remark 2. *Let* $h(x)\in K[x_1,x_2]$. *The Newton polyhedron of* h *(at the origin) can be defined as* $\Gamma:=\Gamma(h)=\Gamma_\infty(h)+(\mathbb{R}_+)^2$, *see* [**6**, Definition 1.2]. *Thus, if* h *is non-degenerate with respect to* $\Gamma_\infty(h)$, *then* h *is non-degenerate with respect to* $\Gamma(h)$. *On the other hand, there are polynomials in* (x_1,x_2) *which are non-degenerate with respect* Γ *but degenerate with respect to* Γ_∞. *For instance,* $h(x,y)=xy+x^6+y^6+(x-y)^7$. *Then Newton polyhedron at origin is not useful for studying arithmetic and geometric matters involving non-degenerate Laurent polynomials.*

2.5. Toric Manifolds. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a simple fan subordinated to Γ_∞ with support $\mathbb{R}^2$. Let Δ_τ be an 2−dimensional simple cone in $\mathcal{F}$ such that $F(a)=\tau$ for any $a\in\Delta_\tau$. Then the face τ of Γ_∞ is necessarily a point. Let a_1,a_2 be the edges of Δ_τ. To this cone, we associate a copy of K^2, denoted as $K^2(\Delta_\tau)$. Denote by $\sigma(\Delta_\tau):K^2(\Delta_\tau)\to K^2$ the map defined by $x_1=y_1^{a_{1,1}}y_2^{a_{1,2}}$, $x_2=y_1^{a_{2,1}}y_2^{a_{2,2}}$, where (x_1,x_2) are the coordinates of K^2, (y_1,y_2) are the coordinates of $K^2(\Delta_\tau)$ as K-analytic manifolds, and $a_1=(a_{1,1},a_{2,1})^T$, $a_2=(a_{1,2},a_{2,2})^T$. We identify two copies $K^2(\Delta_\tau)$ and $K^2(\Delta_{\tau'})$ by the rational map $\sigma^{-1}(\Delta_{\tau'})\circ\sigma(\Delta_\tau):K^2(\Delta_\tau)\to K^2(\Delta_{\tau'})$, the set obtained under this identification is denoted as $X(\Gamma_\infty)$. The atlas $\left(K^2(\Delta_\tau),\sigma(\Delta_\tau)\right)$ gives to $X(\Gamma_\infty)$ a structure of K-analytic manifold of dimension 2. In the Archimedean case this is a well-known fact, see e.g. [**3**], [**11**], [**16**], [**17**]-[**18**], [**21**], [**26**]-[**27**]. The proof of this result can be easily adapted to the p-adic setting using the material of [**23**].

The manifold $X(\Gamma_\infty)$ admits a decomposition as a disjoint union of K-analytic tori. Let Δ be a 2−dimensional cone in $\mathcal{F}$ with generators a_1,a_2. Let Δ_0 be a face of Δ, then *dim* $\Delta_0=0,1$ or 2. The corresponding torus are $T^2(K),T_{\Delta_0}:=\left\{(y_1,y_2)\in K^2(\Delta);y_i=0\text{ if }\Delta_0\text{ is generated by }a_i\text{ for }i=1\text{ or }2\right\}$, or $\{(0,0)\}$, respectively.

Proposition 1. *Let* $f(x)=\sum_l c_l x^l \in K\left[x_1,x_2,x_1^{-1},x_2^{-1}\right]$ *be a non-constant Laurent polynomial which is non-degenerate with respect to* Γ_∞*. Let* $\Delta_\tau\in\mathcal{F}$ *be a cone of dimension* 2 *such that* $F(a)=\tau$ *for any* $a\in\Delta_\tau$*. Then*
(i) $X(\Gamma_\infty)$ *is a* K*-analytic manifold of dimension* 2*.*
(ii) The mapping $\sigma: X(\Gamma_\infty)\rightarrow K^2$ *defined on each* $K^2(\Delta_\tau)$ *as* $\sigma(\Delta_\tau): K^2(\Delta_\tau)\rightarrow K^2$ *is* K*-analytic and proper.*
(iii) $(f\circ\sigma(\Delta_\tau))(y_1,y_2)=y_1^{d(a_1)}y_2^{d(a_2)}\widetilde{f}_{\Delta_\tau}(y_1,y_2)$*, where* $\widetilde{f}_{\Delta_\tau}(y_1,y_2)\in K[y_1,y_2]$ *satisfying* $\widetilde{f}_{\Delta_\tau}(0)\neq 0$*.*
(iv) The set of points of K^2 *in which* σ *is not a* K*-analytic isomorphism is the union of certain coordinate planes.*
(v) The closure of $\sigma^{-1}\left(\left\{x\in K^2; f(x)=0,\ x_1\cdot x_2\neq 0\right\}\right)$ *in* $X(\Gamma_\infty)$ *is a* K*-analytic manifold of dimension* 1 *in some neighborhood of* $\sigma^{-1}(0)$ *in* $X(\Gamma_\infty)$*.*
(vi) Let $\Delta_0\in\mathcal{F}$ *and let* T_{Δ_0} *be the torus corresponding to* Δ_0 *in the decomposition of* $X(\Gamma_\infty)$ *into* K*-analytic tori. Assume that* $\sigma(T_{\Delta_0})=0$*. Then* T_{Δ_0} *intersects the closure of* $\sigma^{-1}\left(\left\{x\in K^2; f(x)=0,\ x_1\cdot x_2\neq 0\right\}\right)$ *in* $X(\Gamma_\infty)$ *transversally.*

The proof is similar to the proofs of Lemmas 2.13-2.15 in [**26**], see also [**21**].

We will call the pair $(X(\Gamma_\infty),\sigma)$ a *toric compactification* for $f: T^2(K)\rightarrow K$ (or for $f^{-1}\{(0,0)\}\cap T^2(K)$).

If in the above construction we replace $\mathcal{F}$ by a simple fan $\mathcal{F}_+$ supported on $\mathbb{R}_+^2$, then Proposition 1 is valid. In this case we will call the pair $(X(\Gamma_\infty),\sigma)$ an *embedded resolution of singularities* for $f: T^2(K)\rightarrow K$.

2.5.1. *Some additional remarks.* We now develop some consequences of Proposition 1 that we will use in the next sections. In particular we want to describe $(f\circ\sigma)(b)$ for some $b\in X(\Gamma_\infty)$, we consider several cases.

Let Δ_τ be a $2-$dimensional simple cone in $\mathcal{F}$ (or $\mathcal{F}_+$) such that $F(a)=\tau$ for any $a\in\Delta_\tau$. Let a_1,a_2 be the generators of Δ_τ, as before. Denote by C_τ the chart $\left(K^2(\Delta_\tau),\sigma(\Delta_\tau)\right)$ of $X(\Gamma_\infty)$, and take a point $b\in K^2(\Delta_\tau)$. Denote by $\mathcal{O}_b$ the local ring of $X(\Gamma_\infty)$ at the point b, and by $\mathcal{O}_b^\times$ the group of units of $\mathcal{O}_b$.

Then in a neighborhood V_0 of the origin in chart C_τ, we can choose local coordinates such that

$$(f\circ\sigma(\Delta_\tau))(y_1,y_2)=\varepsilon(y_1,y_2)\,y_1^{d(a_1)}y_2^{d(a_2)}, \tag{2.2}$$

where $\varepsilon(y_1,y_2)\in\mathcal{O}_0^\times$, satisfying $|\varepsilon(y_1,y_2)|_K=|\varepsilon(0,0)|_K$ for any $(y_1,y_2)\in V_0$.

For $a=(a_1,a_2)\in\mathbb{Z}^2\smallsetminus\{0\}$, we set $\|a\|:=a_1+a_2$. Then in V_0,

$$\sigma(\Delta_\tau)^*(dx_1\wedge dx_2)=\eta(y_1,y_2)\,y_1^{\|a_1\|-1}y_2^{\|a_2\|-1}dy_1\wedge dy_2, \tag{2.3}$$

where $\eta(y_1,y_2)$ is a unit of the local ring of $X(\Gamma_\infty)$ at the origin. Furthermore, we may assume that $|\eta(y_1,y_2)|_K=|\eta(0,0)|_K$ for any $(y_1,y_2)\in V_0$.

We now consider on C_τ the points on $\sigma(\Delta_\tau)^{-1}(0)$, different from the origin of C_τ. After permuting indices, we may assume that one of these points have the form $b=\left(0,\tilde{b}_2\right)$ with $\tilde{b}_2\in K^\times$. Let τ' be the first meet locus of the cone $\Delta_{\tau'}$ spanned by a_1. We can write

$$(f\circ\sigma(\Delta_\tau))(y_1,y_2)=y_1^{d(a_1)}\left(\widetilde{f}(y_2)+O(y_1,y_2)\right), \tag{2.4}$$

where $\widetilde{f}$ is a polynomial in y_2, and $O(y_1,y_2)$ is an analytic function in y_1,y_2 but belonging to the ideal generated by y_1. Note that $d(a_1)$ may be a negative integer or zero. Two cases happen: (i) $\widetilde{f}(\widetilde{b}_2)\neq 0$, (ii) $\widetilde{f}(\widetilde{b}_2)=0$. In the first case, in a neighborhood V_b of b,

$$\left(f\circ\sigma\left(\Delta_\tau\right)\right)\left(y_1,y_2\right)=\varepsilon\left(y_1,y_2\right)y_1^{d(a_1)}, \tag{2.5}$$

$$\sigma\left(\Delta_\tau\right)^*\left(dx_1\wedge dx_2\right)=\eta\left(y_1,y_2\right)\left(y_1^{\|a_1\|-1}\right)dy_1\wedge dy_2, \tag{2.6}$$

where $\varepsilon\left(y_1,y_2\right)$ and $\eta\left(y_1,y_2\right)$ are units in $\mathcal{O}_b$ such that $\left|\varepsilon\left(y_1,y_2\right)\right|_K=\left|\varepsilon\left(b\right)\right|_K$ and $\left|\eta\left(y_1,y_2\right)\right|_K=\left|\eta\left(b\right)\right|_K$ for $\left(y_1,y_2\right)\in V_b$. In the second case, by Proposition 1 (v)-(vi), we can choose new coordinates $y'=\left(y_1,y_2'\right)$ in a neighborhood V_b of b such that

$$\left(f\circ\sigma\left(\Delta_\tau\right)\right)\left(y'\right)=y_1^{d(a_1)}y_2', \tag{2.7}$$

$$\sigma\left(\Delta_\tau\right)^*\left(dx_1\wedge dx_2\right)=\eta\left(y'\right)y_1^{\|a_1\|-1}dy_1\wedge dy_2', \tag{2.8}$$

where $\eta\left(y'\right)\in\mathcal{O}_b^{\times}$ and $\left|\eta\left(y'\right)\right|_K=\left|\eta\left(b\right)\right|_K$ for $\left(y_1,y_2\right)\in V_b$. In addition, $\{y_2'=0\}$ is the description in V_b of the closure of

$$\sigma\left(\Delta_\tau\right)^{-1}\left(\left\{\left(x_1,x_2\right)\in K^2;f\left(x_1,x_2\right)=0,\ x_1\cdot x_2\neq 0\right\}\right)$$

in $X\left(\Gamma_\infty\right)$. We call the attention to the reader on the fact that (2.7)-(2.8) are valid if $d\left(a_1\right)$ is zero.

The closure of $\sigma\left(\Delta_\tau\right)^{-1}\left(\left\{\left(x_1,x_2\right)\in K^2;f\left(x_1,x_2\right)=0,\ x_1\cdot x_2\neq 0\right\}\right)$ in $X\left(\Gamma_\infty\right)$ may have components disjoint with the exceptional divisor of σ. Assume that b is a point in C_τ belonging to one of these components. Since $\sigma(\Delta_\tau)(b)\neq 0$, $f|_{T^2(K)}$ and $\sigma(\Delta_\tau)|_{T^2(K)}$ are $K-$analytic isomorphisms, there exist a neighborhood V_b of b in C_τ and a coordinate system $y=(y_1',y_2')$ on V_b such that

$$(f\circ\sigma(\Delta_\tau))(y)=y_1', \tag{2.9}$$

$$\sigma^*\left(dx_1\wedge dx_2\right)=dy_1', \tag{2.10}$$

for any $y\in V_b$.

2.5.2. *A hypothesis on the critical locus of f.* We consider f as a regular function on $T^2(K)$. The critical set of f is $C_f:=C_f\left(K\right)=T^2(K)\cap\{\nabla f\left(x\right)=0\}$. Later on we will use the following hypothesis:

$$C_f\subset f^{-1}\left(0\right). \tag{H1}$$

Note that $f\left(x\right)$ can be written in a unique way as $f\left(x\right)=\frac{\widehat{f}(x)}{x_1^{d_1}x_2^{d_2}}$, where $\widehat{f}\left(x\right)\in K\left[x_1,x_2\right]$ and $x_1^{d_1}x_2^{d_2}$ does not divide $\widehat{f}\left(x\right)$. With this notation, hypothesis H1 is equivalent to

$$C_{\widehat{f}}(K)\cap T^2(K)\subset\widehat{f}^{-1}\left(0\right)\cap T^2(K).$$

For $b\in X\left(\Gamma_\infty\right)$, if $f\left(\sigma(b)\right)\neq 0$, by hypothesis H1, there is a local coordinate system of the form $\left(f\left(x\right)-f\left(\sigma(b)\right),y_2\right)$ in a neighborhood V_b of b such that

$$\begin{aligned}\left(f\circ\sigma\right)\left(y_1,y_2\right)&=\varepsilon\left(b\right)\left(1+y_1\right),\\ \sigma^*\left(dx_1\wedge dx_2\right)&=\eta\left(y_1,y_2\right)dy_1\wedge dy_2,\end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

with $\left|\eta\left(y_1,y_2\right)\right|_K=\left|\eta\left(b\right)\right|_K$ for any $\left(y_1,y_2\right)\in V_b$.

3. Meromorphic Continuation of Local Zeta Functions

In this section we attach to a Laurent polynomial in two variables a local zeta function and show the existence of a meromorphic continuation to the whole complex plane.

3.1. Quasicharacters.

Let K be a $p-$adic field, i.e. $[K:\mathbb{Q}_p]<\infty$, where $\mathbb{Q}_p$ denotes the field of p-adic numbers. Let R_K be the valuation ring of K, P_K the maximal ideal of R_K, and $\overline{K}=R_K/P_K$ the residue field of K. The cardinality of the residue field of K is denoted by q, thus $\overline{K}=\mathbb{F}_q$. For $z\in K$, $ord\,(z)\in\mathbb{Z}\cup\{+\infty\}$ denotes the valuation of z, and $|z|_K=q^{-ord(z)}$, $ac\ z=z\mathfrak{p}^{-ord(z)}$, where $\mathfrak{p}$ is a fixed uniformizing parameter of R_K.

We equip K^2 with the norm $\|(x_1,x_2)\|_K:=\max\left(|x_1|_K,|x_2|_K\right)$. Then $\left(K^2,\|\cdot\|_K\right)$ is a complete metric space and the metric topology is equal to the product topology.

Let ω be a quasicharacter of $K^\times$, i.e. a continuous homomorphism from $K^\times$ into $\mathbb{C}^\times$. The set of quasicharacters form an Abelian group denoted as $\Omega\left(K^\times\right)$. We define an element ω_s of $\Omega\left(K^\times\right)$ for every $s\in\mathbb{C}$ as $\omega_s\left(z\right)=|z|_K^s=q^{-s\ ord(z)}$. If, for every ω in $\Omega\left(K^\times\right)$, we choose $s\in\mathbb{C}$ satisfying $\omega\left(\mathfrak{p}\right)=q^{-s}$, then $\omega\left(z\right)=\omega_s\left(z\right)\chi\left(ac\ z\right)$ in which $\chi:=\omega\mid_{R_K^\times}$. We denote the conductor of χ as $c\left(\chi\right)$. Hence $\Omega\left(K^\times\right)$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}\times\left(R_K^\times\right)^*$, where $\left(R_K^\times\right)^*$ is the group of characters of $R_K^\times$, and $\Omega\left(K^\times\right)$ is a one dimensional complex manifold. We note that $\sigma\left(\omega\right):=\mathrm{Re}(s)$ depends only on ω, and $|\omega\left(z\right)|=\omega_{\sigma(\omega)}\left(z\right)$. Given an interval (a,b), we define an open subset of $\Omega\left(K^\times\right)$ by

$$\Omega_{(a,b)}\left(K^\times\right)=\left\{\omega\in\Omega\left(K^\times\right);\sigma\left(\omega\right)\in(a,b)\right\}.$$

For further details we refer the reader to [**14**].

The following result will be used later frequently.

Lemma 4. *Take $a\in K$, $\omega\in\Omega\left(K^\times\right)$ and $N\in\mathbb{Z}\smallsetminus\{0\}$. Take also $n,e\in\mathbb{N}$, with $n>0$, and put $\chi=\omega\mid_{R_K^\times}$. Then*

$$\int\limits_{a+\mathfrak{p}^eR_K\smallsetminus\{0\}}\omega\left(z\right)^{-N}|z|_K^{n-1}\,|dz|=\begin{cases}\left(1-q^{-1}\right)\frac{q^{-en+eNs}}{1-q^{-n+Ns}}, & \text{if}\ \begin{array}{c}a\in\mathfrak{p}^eR_K\\ \chi^N=1\end{array}\\[2ex] q^{-e}\omega\left(a\right)^{-N}|a|_K^{n-1}, & \text{if}\ \begin{array}{c}a\notin\mathfrak{p}^eR_K\\ \chi^N\mid_{U'}=1\end{array}\\[2ex] 0, & \text{all other cases,}\end{cases}$$

in which $U'=1+\mathfrak{p}^ea^{-1}R_K$. In addition, the integral converges if $\mathrm{Re}(s)<\frac{n}{N}$.

Proof. The proof of the lemma is an easy variation of the one given for Lemma 8.2.1 in [**14**]. □

We recall that a locally constant function with compact support is called a *Bruhat-Schwartz function.* Denote by $S(K^2)$ the $\mathbb{C}$-vector space of the Bruhat-Schwartz functions.

3.2. Local Zeta Functions and Quadrants.

Definition 2. *Given f a Laurent polynomial, Φ a Bruhat-Schwartz function, and $\omega \in \Omega(K^{\times})$, we attach to these data the following local zeta function:*

$$Z_{\Phi}(\omega, f) := Z_{\Phi}(s, \chi, f) = \int\limits_{T^2(K)} \Phi(x)\, \omega(f(x))\, |dx|, \tag{3.1}$$

where $|dx|$ is the normalized Haar measure of K^2.

The convergence of the integral in (3.1) is not a straightforward matter, this is an important difference with the classical case. Later on we will show the existence of two constants γ_1, γ_2 with $\gamma_1 < \gamma_2$ such that $Z_{\Phi}(\omega, f)$ converges for $\omega \in \Omega_{(\gamma_1,\gamma_2)}(K^{\times})$.

We now introduce the notion of *p-adic quadrant* which will be very useful in studying the convergence of local zeta functions.

We define the *p-adic quadrants of* K^2 as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_1(K) &:= Q_1 = \left\{(x_1,x_2) \in K^2; |x_1|_K \leq 1 \text{ and } |x_2|_K \leq 1\right\};\\
Q_2(K) &:= Q_2 = \left\{(x_1,x_2) \in K^2; |x_1|_K > 1 \text{ and } |x_2|_K \leq 1\right\};\\
Q_3(K) &:= Q_3 = \left\{(x_1,x_2) \in K^2; |x_1|_K > 1 \text{ and } |x_2|_K > 1\right\};\\
Q_4(K) &:= Q_4 = \left\{(x_1,x_2) \in K^2; |x_1|_K \leq 1 \text{ and } |x_2|_K > 1\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Each Q_j is an open and close subset of K^2 and $K^2 = \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{4} Q_j$. Take Φ a locally constant function with compact support, then Φ is a linear combination of characteristic functions $1_{B_{r_i}(\widetilde{x}_i)}(x)$ of balls and each ball $B_{r_i}(\widetilde{x}_i)$ is contained in exactly one quadrant.

We now define

$$Z_{\Phi}^{(j)}(\omega, f) := Z_{\Phi}^{(j)}(s, \chi, f) = \int\limits_{T^2(K)} \Phi(x)\, \omega(f(x))\, |dx|,$$

where Φ is a Bruhat-Schwartz function with support in Q_j for $j \in \{1,2,3,4\}$. Note that $Z_{\Phi}(\omega, f) = \sum_{j=1}^{4} Z_{\Phi_j}^{(j)}(\omega, f)$ for suitable functions Φ_j in $S(K^2)$.

3.3. Local Zeta Functions Supported on the First Quadrant. For $a = (a_1, a_2) \in \mathbb{N}^2 \smallsetminus \{0\}$, set $\|a\| = a_1 + a_2$ as before, and

$$\mathcal{P}(a) := \mathcal{P}(a, f) = \begin{cases} \left\{-\frac{\|a\|}{d(a)} + \frac{2\pi\sqrt{-1}\mathbb{Z}}{d(a)\ln q}\right\}, & \text{if } \ d(a) \neq 0 \\ \\ \varnothing, & \text{if } \ d(a) = 0. \end{cases} \tag{3.2}$$

Let $\mathcal{F}_+$ be a fixed simple fan subordinated to Γ_∞ and supported in $\mathbb{R}_+^2$ as before. Set

$$A(\mathcal{F}_+) := \bigcup_{a \in edges(\mathcal{F}_+)} \left\{\frac{\|a\|}{-d(a)}; d(a) < 0\right\},$$

$$B(\mathcal{F}_+) := \bigcup_{a \in edges(\mathcal{F}_+)} \left\{\frac{\|a\|}{-d(a)}; d(a) > 0\right\},$$

$$\alpha := \alpha_f = \begin{cases} \min_{\gamma \in A(\mathcal{F}_+)} \gamma, & \text{if} \quad A(\mathcal{F}_+) \neq \emptyset \\ \\ +\infty, & \text{if} \quad A(\mathcal{F}_+) = \emptyset, \end{cases}$$

and $\beta := \beta_f = \max_{\gamma \in B(\mathcal{F}_+) \cup \{-1\}} \gamma$.

Theorem 1. *Let f be a non-degenerate Laurent polynomial with respect to Γ_∞, and let $\mathcal{F}_+$ be a fixed simple fan subordinated to Γ_∞ as before. Then the following assertions hold:*
(i) $Z_\Phi^{(1)}(\omega, f)$ converges for $\omega \in \Omega_{(\beta_f, \alpha_f)}(K^\times)$;
(ii) $Z_\Phi^{(1)}(\omega, f)$ has a meromorphic continuation to $\Omega(K^\times)$ as a rational function of $\omega(q)$, and the poles belong to the set

$$\bigcup_{a \in edges(\mathcal{F}_+)} \mathcal{P}(a) \cup \left\{ -1 + \frac{2\pi\sqrt{-1}\ \mathbb{Z}}{\ln q} \right\}.$$

In addition, the multiplicity of any pole ≤ 2.

Proof. Let $(X(\Gamma_\infty), \sigma)$ be an embedded resolution of singularities for $f : T^2(K) \rightarrow K$ as in Proposition 1. We use all the notation given in Sections 2.5, 2.5.1, and 2.5.2. By using the fact that $\sigma : \sigma^{-1}\left(T^2(K)\right) \rightarrow T^2(K)$ is a K-analytic isomorphism, we have

$$Z_\Phi^{(1)}(\omega, f) = \int\limits_{T^2(K)} \Phi(x)\, \omega(f(x))\, |dx| = \int\limits_{\sigma^{-1}(T^2(K))} \Phi \circ \sigma(y)\, \omega(f \circ \sigma(y))\, |\sigma^*(dx)|.$$

Since $S = \sigma^{-1}(\text{supp}\ \Phi)$ is compact, by passing to a sufficiently fine covering of S, such that (2.2)-(2.3), (2.5)-(2.6), (2.7)-(2.8), (2.9)-(2.10) hold, $Z_\Phi^{(1)}(\omega, f)$ becomes a finite sum of integrals of the following types:

$$\begin{aligned} J_0(\omega) &= \Phi(\sigma(b))\, \omega(\varepsilon(b))\, |\eta(b)|_K \times \\ &\prod_{j=1}^{2} \int\limits_{\mathfrak{p}^e R_K \smallsetminus \{0\}} \omega(y_j)^{d(a_j)}\, |y_j|_K^{\|a_j\|-1}\ |dy_j|, \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

where b is a point in $X(\Gamma_\infty)$, $c = (c_1, c_2) \in K^2$, $e \in \mathbb{N}$, and $r \in \{1, 2\}$, see (2.2)-(2.3);

$$\begin{aligned} J_1(\omega) &= q^{-e}\Phi(\sigma(b))\, \omega(\varepsilon(b))\, |\eta(b)|_K \times \\ &\int\limits_{\mathfrak{p}^e R_K \smallsetminus \{0\}} \omega(y_1)^{d(a_1)}\, |y_1|_K^{\|a_1\|-1} |dy_1|, \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

see (2.5)-(2.6);

$$\begin{aligned} J_2(\omega) = \Phi(\sigma(b))\, |\eta(b)|_K & \int\limits_{\mathfrak{p}^e R_K \smallsetminus \{0\}} \omega(y_1)^{d(a_1)}\, |y_1|_K^{\|a_1\|-1}\ |dy_1| \times \\ & \int\limits_{\mathfrak{p}^e R_K \smallsetminus \{0\}} \omega(y_2')\ |dy_2'|, \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

see (2.7)-(2.8);

$$J_3(\omega) = q^{-e}\Phi\left(\sigma\left(b\right)\right) \int\limits_{\mathfrak{p}^e R_K \smallsetminus \{0\}} \omega(y_1')\left|dy_1'\right|, \tag{3.6}$$

see (2.9)-(2.10); finally if $f\left(\sigma(b)\right) \neq 0$,

$$J_4(\omega) = q^{-2e}\Phi\left(\sigma\left(b\right)\right)\omega\left(\varepsilon\left(b\right)\right)\left|\eta\left(b\right)\right|_K. \tag{3.7}$$

Parts (i)-(ii) of the Lemma follow by applying Lemma 4 to integrals (3.3)-(3.6). □

Remark 3. *If we use hypothesis H1, in the case $f\left(\sigma(b)\right) \neq 0$ by using (2.11) we have*

$$J_4(\omega) = q^{-e}\Phi\left(\sigma\left(b\right)\right)\omega\left(\varepsilon\left(b\right)\right)\left|\eta\left(b\right)\right|_K \int\limits_{c_1+\mathfrak{p}^e R_K} \chi\left(1+y_1\right)\left|dy_1\right|. \tag{3.8}$$

Example 2. *The local zeta functions $Z_\Phi^{(1)}(\omega, f)$ may have poles with positive real parts. Take $f(x,y) = x^{-3} + y^2 + y^4$, Φ the characteristic function of $\left(\mathfrak{p}R_K\right)^2$, and $\omega = \omega_s$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} Z_\Phi^{(1)}(\omega, f) &= \int\limits_{(\mathfrak{p}R_K \smallsetminus \{0\})^2} \left|f\left(x,y\right)\right|_K^s \left|dxdy\right| \\ &= \sum_{a=1}^{\infty}\sum_{b=1}^{\infty} \int\limits_{\mathfrak{p}^a R_K^\times \times \mathfrak{p}^b R_K^\times} \left|f\left(x,y\right)\right|_K^s \left|dxdy\right| = \frac{\left(1-q^{-1}\right)q^{-2+3s}}{1-q^{-1+3s}}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the integral converges for $\operatorname{Re}(s) < \frac{1}{3}$.

Remark 4. *We recall that the set of edges of $\mathcal{F}_+$ can be partitioned as $\mathfrak{D}(\mathcal{F}_+) \cup \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F}_+) \cup \mathcal{E}'(\mathcal{F}_+)$. In the case in which $f\left(x\right) \in K\left[x_1, x_2\right]$ and Γ is the Newton polyhedra at origin, there are no poles belonging to $\cup_{a\in\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F}_+)}\mathcal{P}(a) \cup \cup_{a\in\mathcal{E}'(\mathcal{F}_+)}\mathcal{P}(a)$, see* [**5**], [**6**], [**28**], [**31**], [**32**]. *This fact is not true if $f\left(x\right) \in K\left[x_1, x_2, x_1^{-1}, x_2^{-1}\right]$ and $\Gamma = \Gamma_\infty$, see Example 3.*

3.4. Local Zeta Functions Supported on the Second,Third and Fourth Quadrants.

Theorem 2. *Let f be a non-constant Laurent polynomial (not necessarily non degenerate with respect to Γ_∞).*
(i) There exist constants $\beta_f^{(j)} < 0$, $\alpha_f^{(j)} > 0$, such that $Z_\Phi^{(j)}\left(\omega, f\right)$ converges for $\omega \in \Omega_{\left(\beta_f^{(j)}, \alpha_f^{(j)}\right)}\left(K^\times\right)$, for $j = 2, 3, 4$.
(ii) $Z_\Phi^{(j)}\left(\omega, f\right)$ have a meromorphic continuation to $\Omega\left(K^\times\right)$ as a rational function of $\omega\left(q\right)$, for $j = 2, 3, 4$.
(iii) Assume that

$$f\left(x_1, x_2, x_1^{-1}, x_2^{-1}\right) = \frac{\widehat{f}\left(x_1, x_2\right)}{x_1^{d_1}x_2^{d_2}} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{c_i x_1^{n_i} + c_i' x_1^{-m_i}}{x_2^{b_i}} + f_0\left(x_1, x_2, x_1^{-1}\right), \tag{3.9}$$

with $b_i, n_i, m_i \in \mathbb{N}$ *and* $b_k > b_j$, $k \neq j$. *Pick an embedded resolution of singularities of the divisor* $\widehat{f}^{-1}\{(0,0)\}$ *with numerical data* (v_i, N_i), $i \in T$. *Then the poles of* $Z_{\Phi}^{(2)}(s,\chi,f)$ *belong to the set*

$$\bigcup_{i\in T}\left\{\frac{-v_i}{N_i}+\frac{2\pi\sqrt{-1}\mathbb{Z}}{\ln q}\right\}\bigcup\left\{\frac{1}{b_k}+\frac{2\pi\sqrt{-1}\mathbb{Z}}{\ln q}\right\}, \tag{3.10}$$

where the second term in (3.10) does not appear if $b_k = 0$.
(iv) Assume that

$$f\left(x_1,x_2,x_1^{-1},x_2^{-1}\right)=\frac{\widehat{f}\left(x_1,x_2\right)}{x_1^{d_1}x_2^{d_2}}=\sum_{i=1}^{l}\frac{c_ix_2^{m_i}+c_i'x_2^{-n_i}}{x_1^{e_i}}+f_0\left(x_1,x_2,x_2^{-1}\right),$$

with $e_i, m_i, n_i \in \mathbb{N}$ *and* $e_l > e_j$, $l \neq j$. *Then the poles of* $Z_{\Phi}^{(4)}(s,\chi,f)$ *belong to the set*

$$\bigcup_{i\in T}\left\{\frac{-v_i}{N_i}+\frac{2\pi\sqrt{-1}\mathbb{Z}}{\ln q}\right\}\bigcup\left\{\frac{1}{e_l}+\frac{2\pi\sqrt{-1}\mathbb{Z}}{\ln q}\right\}, \tag{3.11}$$

where the second term in (3.11) does not appear if $e_l = 0$.
(v) The poles of $Z_{\Phi}^{(3)}(s,\chi,f)$ *belong to the set*

$$\bigcup_{i\in T}\left\{\frac{-v_i}{N_i}+\frac{2\pi\sqrt{-1}\mathbb{Z}}{\ln q}\right\}. \tag{3.12}$$

PROOF. We first prove (i), (ii) and (iii) in the case $j = 2$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\Phi(x_1, x_2)$ is the characteristic function of a ball

$$B := \{\widetilde{x}_1 + \mathfrak{p}^e R_K\} \times \{\widetilde{x}_2 + \mathfrak{p}^e R_K\} \subset Q_2$$

with $e \in \mathbb{N} \smallsetminus \{0\}$, $ord(\widetilde{x}_1) < 0$ and $ord(\widetilde{x}_2) \geq 0$. Two subcases occur: $\widetilde{x}_2 \neq 0$, $\widetilde{x}_2 = 0$. In the subcase $\widetilde{x}_2 \neq 0$, we may assume that $0 \leq ord(\widetilde{x}_2) \leq e - 1$. Since

$$|\widetilde{x}_1+\mathfrak{p}^ey_1|_K^{d_1}\,|\widetilde{x}_2+\mathfrak{p}^ey_2|_K^{d_2}=|\widetilde{x}_1|_K^{d_1}\,|\widetilde{x}_2|_K^{d_2}\ \text{ for } y_1,y_2\in R_K,$$

we have

$$|f|_K^s\,|_B=\frac{\left|\widehat{f}\right|_K^s|_B}{|\widetilde{x}_1|_K^{d_1s}\,|\widetilde{x}_2|_K^{d_2s}}.$$

On the other hand,

$$\chi\left(ac\left(\widetilde{x}_1+\mathfrak{p}^ey_1\right)\right)=\chi\left(ac\left(\widetilde{x}_1\right)\right)\ \text{ for any } y_1\in R_K,\text{ if } e-ord\left(\widetilde{x}_1\right)\geq c\left(\chi\right),$$
$$\chi\left(ac\left(\widetilde{x}_2+\mathfrak{p}^ey_2\right)\right)=\chi\left(ac\left(\widetilde{x}_2\right)\right)\ \text{ for any } y_2\in R_K,\text{if } e-ord\left(\widetilde{x}_2\right)\geq c\left(\chi\right),$$

here $c(\chi)$ denotes the conductor of χ, therefore

$$Z_{\Phi}^{(2)}(s,\chi,f)=\frac{1}{\omega\left(\widetilde{x}_1\right)^{d_1}\omega\left(\widetilde{x}_2\right)^{d_2}}Z_{\Phi}\left(s,\chi,\widehat{f}\right)\ \text{ if } e\geq ord\left(\widetilde{x}_2\right)+c\left(\chi\right).$$

We may assume that $\widehat{f}(x_1, x_2) = 0$ for some point in the support of Φ because otherwise $Z_{\Phi}\left(s,\chi,\widehat{f}\right)$ is holomorphic in the whole complex plane, and then the announced assertions follow trivially. Since $Z_{\Phi}\left(s,\chi,\widehat{f}\right)$ is a classical local zeta function, it has a meromorphic continuation to the whole complex plane with poles having negative real parts. Furthermore, given an embedded resolution of singularities of the divisor $\widehat{f}^{-1}\{(0,0)\}$, with numerical data (v_i, N_i), $i \in T$, the possible poles of $Z_{\Phi}\left(s,\chi,\widehat{f}\right)$ belong to the set $\cup_{i\in T}\left\{\frac{-v_i}{N_i}+\frac{2\pi\sqrt{-1}\mathbb{Z}}{\ln q}\right\}$, see e.g. [**14**, Theorem 8.2.1]. We now recall that the *log-canonical threshold* $-\beta\left(\widehat{f}\right):=\min_{i\in T}\frac{v_i}{N_i}$ is a positive rational number depending only on $\widehat{f}$ such that $\beta\left(\widehat{f}\right)$ is pole of some $Z_{\Phi_0}\left(s,\chi_{triv},\widehat{f}\right)$, and that $Z_{\Phi}\left(s,\chi,\widehat{f}\right)$ is holomorphic on $\mathrm{Re}(s)>\beta\left(\widehat{f}\right)$ for any Φ,χ, see e.g. [**15**, p. 33], [**28**, Theorem 2.7]. Then $Z_{\Phi}^{(2)}(s,\chi,f)$ converges for $\omega\in\Omega_{\left(\beta\left(\widehat{f}\right),+\infty\right)}(K^{\times})$.

We now consider the subcase $\widetilde{x}_2=0$. We assume that $f\left(x_1,x_2,x_1^{-1},x_2^{-1}\right)$ has form (3.9) with $b_k\neq 0$. There exists a constant $e_0\left(b_1,\ldots,b_k,f_0\right)$ such that

$$\left|f\left(x_1,x_2,x_1^{-1},x_2^{-1}\right)\right|_K^s=\left|c_k\right|_K^s\left|\widetilde{x}_1\right|_K^{n_k s}\left|\frac{1}{x_2^{b_k}}\right|_K^s,$$

$$\chi\left(ac\left(f\left(x_1,x_2,x_1^{-1},x_2^{-1}\right)\right)\right)=\chi\left(ac\left(c_k\widetilde{x}_1^{n_k}+c_k'\widetilde{x}_1^{-m_k}\right)\right)\chi\left(ac\left(\frac{1}{x_2^{b_k}}\right)\right),$$

for $e\geq e_0\left(b_1,\ldots,b_k,f_0,\chi\right)$, then

$$Z_{\Phi}^{(2)}(s,\chi,f)=\left|c_k\right|_K^s\left|\widetilde{x}_1\right|_K^{n_k s}\chi\left(ac\left(c_k\widetilde{x}_1^{n_k}+c_k'\widetilde{x}_1^{-m_k}\right)\right)Z_{\Phi}^{(2)}\left(s,\chi,\frac{1}{x_2^{b_k}}\right),$$

for $e\geq e_0\left(b_1,\ldots,b_k,f_0,\chi\right)$. By applying Lemma 4 we get that $Z_{\Phi}^{(2)}(\omega,f)$ converges for $\omega\in\Omega_{\left(-\infty,\frac{1}{b_k}\right)}(K^{\times})$ and the possible poles belong to the set $\left\{\frac{1}{b_k}+\frac{2\pi\sqrt{-1}\mathbb{Z}}{\ln q}\right\}$. If $b_k=0$, for e big enough we have $Z_{\Phi}^{(2)}(s,\chi,f)=\frac{1}{\omega(\widetilde{x}_1)^{d_1}}Z_{\Phi}\left(s,\chi,\widehat{f}\right)$, and then the announced assertions follow from the corresponding results for $Z_{\Phi}\left(s,\chi,\widehat{f}\right)$.

The proof of (i), (ii) and (iii) in the case $j=4$ is similar to the one given for the previous case. We now consider case $j=3$. In this case by taking e big enough we have $Z_{\Phi}^{(3)}(s,\chi,f)=\frac{1}{\omega(\widetilde{x}_1)^{d_1}\omega(\widetilde{x}_2)^{d_2}}Z_{\Phi}\left(s,\chi,\widehat{f}\right)$. Now the announced assertions follow from the corresponding results for $Z_{\Phi}\left(s,\chi,\widehat{f}\right)$. □

3.5. Local Zeta Functions for Laurent Polynomials in Two Variables.

THEOREM 3. *Let f be a Laurent polynomial which is no-degenerate with respect to Γ_{∞}. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a fixed simple fan subordinated to Γ_{∞} with support $\mathbb{R}^2$, and let $\left(X\left(\Gamma_{\infty}\right),\sigma\right)$ be a fixed compactification for $f:T^2(K)\rightarrow K$. Then the following assertions hold:*
(i) there exist constants $\beta_f<0$, $\alpha_f>0$ such that $Z_{\Phi}(\omega,f)$ converges for $\omega\in\Omega_{\left(\beta_f,\alpha_f\right)}(K^{\times})$;
(ii) $Z_{\Phi}(\omega,f)$ has a meromorphic continuation to $\Omega(K^{\times})$ as a rational function of $\omega(q)$, and the poles belong to the set

$$\bigcup_{a\in edges(\mathcal{F})}\mathcal{P}(a)\cup\left\{-1+\frac{2\pi\sqrt{-1}\ \mathbb{Z}}{\ln q}\right\},$$

with $\mathcal{P}(a)$ as in (3.2). In addition, the multiplicity of any pole ≤ 2.

Proof. Since $Z_{\Phi}\left(\omega,f\right)=\sum_{j=1}^{4}Z_{\Phi_j}^{(j)}\left(\omega,f\right)$ for suitable functions Φ_j in $S(K^2)$, Theorems 1-2 imply the existence of constants $\alpha_f>0$, $\beta_f<0$ such that $Z_{\Phi}\left(\omega,f\right)$ converges for $\omega\in\Omega_{(\beta_f,\alpha_f)}\left(K^{\times}\right)$, and that $Z_{\Phi}\left(\omega,f\right)$ has a meromorphic continuation as a rational function. The description of the poles is obtained as in the proof of Theorem 1. □

3.6. Some Additional Results on Poles for Local Zeta Functions Supported on the First Quadrant.

Denote by $S(R_K^2)$ the $\mathbb{C}$-vector space of Bruhat-Schwartz functions with support in R_K^2. As a consequence of Theorem 1, the mapping $\Phi\to Z_{\Phi}^{(1)}\left(\omega,f\right)$ defines a meromorphic distribution on $S(R_K^2)$. Denote this distribution by $Z_{\bullet}\left(\omega\right)$. The set of poles of $Z_{\bullet}^{(1)}\left(\omega\right)$ is the set of poles of all the meromorphic functions $Z_{\Phi}^{(1)}\left(\omega,f\right)$ for $\Phi\in S(R_K^2)$ and $\omega\in\Omega\left(K^{\times}\right)$.

Proposition 2. *With the above notation. If $A\left(\mathcal{F}_+\right)\neq\emptyset$, then $Z_{\bullet}^{(1)}\left(\omega\right)$ has a pole s satisfying $\operatorname{Re}(s)=\alpha$. Furthermore, the multiplicity of such a pole $\mu\left(\alpha\right)$ can be calculated as follows. Given $l\in\{1,2\}$, define $\mathcal{L}_l\left(\alpha\right)$ as*

$$\left\{\begin{array}{c}\Delta\in\mathcal{F}_+;\Delta\ \text{has exactly } l \text{ edges, } a_k\text{, satisfying}\\ \frac{\|a_k\|}{-d(a_k)}=\alpha \text{ for } k=1,\ldots,l\end{array}\right\}.$$

Then

$$\mu\left(\alpha\right):=\mu=\max\left\{l;\mathcal{L}_l\left(\alpha\right)\neq\emptyset\right\}.$$

Proof. We use all the notation introduced in the proof of Theorem 1. Take Φ to be the characteristic function of an open compact ball $\left(\mathfrak{p}^eR_K\right)^2$, $e\geq 2$, containing the origin. We also take $\omega=\omega_s$. To prove the result, it is sufficient to show that

$$\lim_{s\to\alpha}\left(1-q^{s-\alpha}\right)^{\mu(\alpha)}Z_{\Phi}^{(1)}\left(\omega_s,f\right)>0. \tag{3.13}$$

Since $Z_{\Phi}^{(1)}\left(\omega,f\right)$ is a finite sum of integrals of types $J_i(\omega_s)$, $i=0,1,2,3,4$ (see (3.3) -(3.7)), it is sufficient to show the following:

$$\lim_{s\to\alpha}\left(1-q^{s-\alpha}\right)^{\mu(\alpha)}J_i(\omega_s)\geq 0,\ i=0,1,2,3 \tag{3.14}$$

and

$$\lim_{s\to\alpha}\left(1-q^{s-\alpha}\right)^{\mu(\alpha)}J_{i_0}(\omega_s)>0,\ \text{for some } i_0\in\left\{0,1,2\right\}. \tag{3.15}$$

Since $\mu\in\{1,2\}$, we first consider the case $\mu=2$, the other case is treated in a similar form. Let $\Delta_\tau\in\mathcal{L}_2\left(\alpha\right)$ and let a_1,a_2, be its edges, with $\frac{\|a_1\|}{-d(a_1)}=\frac{\|a_2\|}{-d(a_2)}=\alpha$. Take $b\in X(\Gamma_\infty)$ to be the origin of the chart $(K^2(\Delta_\tau),\sigma(\Delta_\tau))$. Let V_b be a small open subset containing b in $(K^2(\Delta_\tau),\sigma(\Delta_\tau))$, we may assume that $V_b=\left(\mathfrak{p}^eR_K\right)^2$. By using Lemma 4, $J_0(\omega_s)$ equals

$$\Phi\left(\sigma\left(b\right)\right)\left|\varepsilon\left(b\right)\right|_K^s\left|\eta\left(b\right)\right|_K\left(1-q^{-1}\right)^2\left(\frac{q^{-e||a_1||-ed(a_1)s}}{1-q^{-||a_1||-d(a_1)s}}\right)\left(\frac{q^{-e||a_2||-ed(a_2)s}}{1-q^{-||a_2||-d(a_2)s}}\right)$$

$$=\Phi\left(\sigma\left(b\right)\right)\left|\varepsilon\left(b\right)\right|_K^s\left|\eta\left(b\right)\right|_K\left(1-q^{-1}\right)^2\left(\frac{q^{-(e-1)d(a_1)(s-\alpha)}}{1-q^{d(a_1)(s-\alpha)}}\right)\left(\frac{q^{-(e-1)d(a_2)(s-\alpha)}}{1-q^{d(a_2)(s-\alpha)}}\right)$$

$$=\frac{\Phi\left(\sigma\left(b\right)\right)\left|\varepsilon\left(b\right)\right|_K^s\left|\eta\left(b\right)\right|_K\left(1-q^{-1}\right)^2}{\left(1-q^{(s-\alpha)}\right)^2}\times$$

$$\frac{q^{-(e-1)(s-\alpha)(d(a_1)+d(a_2))}}{\left(\prod\limits_{\varsigma_i\neq1,\varsigma_i^{d(a_1)}=1}\left(1-\varsigma_i q^{(s-\alpha)}\right)\right)\left(\prod\limits_{\varsigma_i\neq1,\varsigma_i^{d(a_2)}=1}\left(1-\varsigma_i q^{(s-\alpha)}\right)\right)}.$$

In consequence

$$\lim_{s\rightarrow\alpha}\left(1-q^{s-\alpha}\right)^{\mu}J_0(\omega_s)>0.$$

By using a similar reasoning, one verifies that

$$\lim_{s\rightarrow\alpha}\left(1-q^{s-\alpha}\right)^{\mu}J_i(\omega_s)=0 \text{ for } i=1,2,3,4.$$

Now if $\Delta\notin\mathcal{L}_2\left(\alpha\right)$ is a two dimensional cone, then in the chart corresponding to this cone, $\lim_{s\rightarrow\alpha}\left(1-q^{s-\alpha}\right)^{\mu}J_i(\omega_s)=0$, for $i=0,1,2,3,4$. □

PROPOSITION 3. *(i) If* $B\left(\mathcal{F}_+\right)\neq\emptyset$ *and* $\beta_f>-1$*, then* $Z_{\bullet}^{(1)}\left(\omega\right)$ *has a pole* s *satisfying* $\mathrm{Re}(s)=\beta_f$. *Furthermore, the multiplicity of such a pole* $\mu\left(\beta_f\right)$ *can be calculated as follows. Given* $l\in\{1,2\}$*, define* $\mathcal{M}_l\left(\beta_f\right)$ *as*

$$\left\{\begin{array}{c}\Delta\in\mathcal{F}_+;\Delta \text{ has exactly } l \text{ edges, } a_k\text{, satisfying}\\ \frac{\|a_k\|}{-d(a_k)}=\beta_f\text{, for } k=1,\ldots,l\end{array}\right\}.$$

Then

$$\mu\left(\beta_f\right)=\max\left\{l;\mathcal{M}_l\left(\beta_f\right)\neq\emptyset\right\}.$$

(ii) If $B\left(\mathcal{F}_+\right)\neq\emptyset$, $\beta_f=-1$ *and* $\mu\left(\beta_f\right)=2$*, then* $Z_{\bullet}^{(1)}\left(\omega\right)$ *has a pole* s *satisfying* $\mathrm{Re}(s)=-1$ *with multiplicity* 2.

PROOF. (i) We use all the notation introduced in the proof of Theorem 1. Take Φ to be the characteristic function of an open compact ball $\left(\mathfrak{p}^e R_K\right)^2$ containing the origin. We also take $\omega=\omega_s$. As in the Proof of Proposition 2, it is sufficient to show the following:

$$\lim_{s\rightarrow\beta}\left(1-q^{s-\beta}\right)^{\mu(\beta)}J_i(\omega_s)\leq0,\ i=0,1,2,3,4$$

and

$$\lim_{s\rightarrow\beta}\left(1-q^{s-\alpha}\right)^{\mu(\beta)}J_{i_0}(\omega_s)<0, \text{ for some } i_0\in\left\{0,1,2\right\}.$$

Since $\mu\in\{1,2\}$, we first consider the case $\mu=1$, the other case is treated in a similar form. Let Δ in $\mathcal{L}_1\left(\beta\right)$ generated by a_1, with $\frac{\|a_1\|}{-d(a_1)}=\beta$. Take another vector a_2 such that the cone Δ_τ generated by a_1, a_2 is in $\mathcal{F}_+$. In the chart $(K^2(\Delta_\tau),\sigma(\Delta_\tau))$ take $b\in X(\Gamma_\infty)$ a generic point of the divisor corresponding to the datum $(d\,(a_1)\,,\|a_1\|)$. Let V_b be a small open subset containing b in $(K^2(\Delta_\tau),\sigma(\Delta_\tau))$, we may assume that $V_b=(\mathfrak{p}^eR_K)^2$. By using Lemma 4,

$$\begin{aligned}J_1\left(\omega_s\right)&=\frac{q^{-e}\Phi\left(\sigma\left(b\right)\right)\omega\left(\varepsilon\left(b\right)\right)\left|\eta\left(b\right)\right|_K\left(1-q^{-1}\right)q^{-e\|a_1\|-ed(a_1)s}}{1-q^{-\|a_1\|-d(a_1)s}}\\&=\frac{q^{-e}\Phi\left(\sigma\left(b\right)\right)\omega\left(\varepsilon\left(b\right)\right)\left|\eta\left(b\right)\right|_K\left(1-q^{-1}\right)q^{-ed(a_1)(s-\beta)}}{\left(1-q^{-(s-\beta)}\right)\left(\displaystyle\prod_{\varsigma_i\neq1,\varsigma_i^{d(a_1)}=1}\left(1-\varsigma_iq^{-(s-\beta)}\right)\right)}\end{aligned}$$

then $\lim_{s\to\beta}\left(1-q^{s-\beta}\right)^\mu J_1(\omega_s)<0$.

We now consider the case in which b is the intersection point of a divisor corresponding to $(d\,(a_1)\,,\|a_1\|)$, with $\frac{\|a_1\|}{-d(a_1)}=\beta$, and a divisor corresponding to $(1,1)$. Let V_b be a small open subset containing b in $(K^2(\Delta_\tau),\sigma(\Delta_\tau))$, we may assume that $V_b=(\mathfrak{p}^eR_K)^2$. Then

$$J_2(\omega_s)=\Phi\left(\sigma\left(b\right)\right)\left|\eta\left(b\right)\right|_K\int\limits_{\mathfrak{p}^eR_K\smallsetminus\{0\}}\left|y_1\right|_K^{sd(a_1)+\|a_1\|-1}\ \left|dy_1\right|\times$$

$$\begin{aligned}\int\limits_{\mathfrak{p}^eR_K\smallsetminus\{\ 0\}}\left|y_2'\right|_K^s\ \left|dy_2'\right|&=\frac{\Phi\left(\sigma\left(b\right)\right)\left|\eta\left(b\right)\right|_K\left(1-q^{-1}\right)^2q^{-e(\|a_1\|+1)-e(d(a_1)+1)s}}{\left(1-q^{-\|a_1\|-d(a_1)s}\right)\left(1-q^{-1-s}\right)}\\&:=\frac{A(q^{-s})}{\left(1-q^{-\|a_1\|-d(a_1)s}\right)\left(1-q^{-1-s}\right)},\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{s\to\beta}\left(1-q^{s-\beta}\right)^\mu J_2(\omega_s)&=\lim_{s\to\beta}\frac{\left(1-q^{s-\beta}\right)^\mu}{\left(1-q^{-1-s}\right)}\lim_{s\to\beta}\frac{A(q^{-s})\left(1-q^{s-\alpha}\right)^\mu}{1-q^{-\|a_1\|-d(a_1)s}}\\&=\left(\frac{1}{1-q^{-1-\beta}}\right)\lim_{s\to\beta}\frac{A(q^{-s})\left(1-q^{s-\alpha}\right)^\mu}{1-q^{-\|a_1\|-d(a_1)s}}<0,\end{aligned}$$

since $\beta>-1$ implies that $\frac{1}{1-q^{-1-\beta}}>0$.

Consider now the case in which b is the intersection point of a divisor corresponding to $(d\,(a_1)\,,\|a_1\|)$, with $\frac{\|a_1\|}{-d(a_1)}=\beta$, and a divisor corresponding to $(d\,(a_1)\,,\|a_1\|)$, with $\frac{\|a_2\|}{-d(a_2)}\neq\beta$. Let V_b be an open compact subset containing b in $(K^2(\Delta_\tau),\sigma(\Delta_\tau))$, as before we may assume that $V_b=(\mathfrak{p}^eR_K)^2$. Then $J_0(\omega_s)$ equals

$$\begin{aligned}&\Phi\left(\sigma\left(b\right)\right)\left|\varepsilon\left(b\right)\right|_K^s\left|\eta\left(b\right)\right|_K\left(1-q^{-1}\right)^2\left(\frac{q^{-e||a_1||-ed(a_1)s}}{1-q^{-||a_1||-d(a_1)s}}\right)\left(\frac{q^{-e||a_2||-ed(a_2)s}}{1-q^{-||a_2||-d(a_2)s}}\right)\\&:=\frac{B(q^{-s})}{\left(1-q^{-||a_1||-d(a_1)s}\right)\left(1-q^{-||a_2||-d(a_2)s}\right)}\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{s\to\beta}\left(1-q^{s-\beta}\right)^{\mu}J_0(\omega_s)\\&=\frac{1}{1-q^{-||a_2||-d(a_2)\beta}}\lim_{s\to\beta}\left(1-q^{s-\beta}\right)^{\mu}\left(\frac{B(q^{-s})}{1-q^{-||a_1||-d(a_1)s}}\right)<0\end{aligned}$$

because $\frac{1}{1-q^{-||a_2||-d(a_2)\beta}}>0$.

On the other hand, $\lim_{s\to\beta}\left(1-q^{s-\beta}\right)^{\mu}J_i(\omega_s)=0$ for $i=3,4$.

Finally, if Δ_τ is a two dimensional cone in $\mathcal{F}_+$ generated by a_1, a_2, with $\frac{\|a_1\|}{-d(a_1)}\neq\beta$ and $\frac{\|a_2\|}{-d(a_2)}\neq\beta$, then $\lim_{s\to\beta}\left(1-q^{s-\beta}\right)^{\mu}J_i(\omega_s)=0$ for $i=0,1,2,3,4$.

(ii) The proof follows the reasoning used in the previous part. $\square$

REMARK 5. *If $A(\mathcal{F}_+)\neq\emptyset$, we set $\alpha_{\max}$:=$\max_{\gamma\in A(\mathcal{F}_+)}\gamma$ and $\mu(\alpha_{\max}):=\max\{l;\mathcal{L}_l(\alpha_{\max})\neq\emptyset\}$, with $\mathcal{L}_l(\alpha_{\max})$ defined as in Proposition 2. If $\mu(\alpha_{\max})=2$, then $Z_{\bullet}^{(1)}(\omega)$ has a pole s satisfying $\mathrm{Re}(s)=\alpha_{\max}$ with multiplicity $\mu(\alpha_{\max})$. This fact can be established by using the technique given in the proof of Proposition 2, but not the case $\mu(\alpha_{\max})=1$.*

THEOREM 4. *Let f be a Laurent polynomial which is non-degenerate with respect to Γ_∞. Assume that $\beta_f\neq-1$ or that $\beta_f=-1$ and $\mu(\beta_f)=2$. Set for $m\in\mathbb{N}\smallsetminus\{0\}$,*

$$V_{-m}(f,\Phi):=vol\left(\left\{x\in supp(\Phi)\cap T^2(K);|f(x)|_K=q^{-m}\right\}\right)$$

and

$$V_m(f,\Phi):=vol\left(\left\{x\in supp(\Phi)\cap T^2(K);|f(x)|_K=q^{m}\right\}\right).$$

Then the following assertions hold.
(i) For m big enough, $V_{-m}(f,\Phi)$ has an asymptotic expansion of the form

$$V_{-m}(f,\Phi)=\sum_{\gamma}c_m(\gamma,f)\,m^{j_\gamma}q^{\gamma m}$$

where γ runs through of the poles of $Z_\Phi^{(1)}(s,\chi_{triv},f)$ such that $\mathrm{Re}(\gamma)\in B(\mathcal{F}_+)$, $c_m(\gamma,f)$ is a complex number and $j_\gamma\leq$ the multiplicity of $\gamma-1$. Furthermore

$$V_{-m}(f,\Phi)\leq Am^{\mu(\beta_f)-1}q^{m\beta_f}\text{ for }m\geq0,$$

where A is a positive constant.
(ii) If $|f|_K$ is not bounded on supp(Φ) $\cap\,T^2(K)$, for m big enough, $V_m(f,\Phi)$ has an asymptotic expansion of the form

$$V_m(f,\Phi)=\sum_{\gamma}c_m(\gamma,f)\,m^{j_\gamma}q^{\gamma m}$$

where γ runs through of the poles of $Z_\Phi^{(1)}(s,\chi_{triv},f)$ such that $\mathrm{Re}(\gamma)\in A(\mathcal{F}_+)$, $c_m(\gamma,f)$ is a complex number and $j_\gamma\leq$ the multiplicity of $\gamma-1$. Furthermore

$$V_m(f,\Phi)\leq Bmq^{m\alpha_{\max}}\text{ for }m\geq0,$$

where B is a positive constant and $\alpha_{\max}:=\max_{\gamma\in A(\mathcal{F}_+)}\gamma$.

Proof. Since

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{\Phi}^{(1)}(s,\chi_{triv},f) &= \int\limits_{T^2(K)} \Phi\left(x\right) \left|f\left(x\right)\right|_K^s \left|dx\right| \\ &= \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}} vol\left(\left\{x\in \operatorname{supp}\left(\Phi\right); \left|f\left(x\right)\right|_K = q^{-m}\right\} t^m\right) \end{aligned}$$

for $\beta_f < \mathrm{Re}(s) < \alpha_f$, with $q^{-s} := t$. The announced estimations follow from Theorem 1 and Proposition 3 by expanding $Z_{\Phi}^{(1)}(s,\chi_{triv},f)$ into partial fractions over the complex numbers. Since we will need this technique later we present here some details. For $m\in\mathbb{Z}\smallsetminus\{0\}$, we write $m=|m|\,sgn\left(m\right)=|m|\left(\pm1\right)$. We also set $U_f:=\left\{\varsigma\in\mathbb{C}:\varsigma^f=1\right\}$ for $f\in\mathbb{N}\smallsetminus\{0\}$. By using the identity

$$1-q^{-e}t^{\pm f}=\left(1-q^{\frac{-e}{f}}t^{\pm1}\right)\prod_{\varsigma\in U_f\smallsetminus\{1\}}\left(1-q^{\frac{-e}{f}}\varsigma t^{\pm1}\right),\ e,f\in\mathbb{N}\smallsetminus\{0\},$$

we have

$$\frac{1}{1-q^{-\|a_k\|}t^{d(a_k)}}=\frac{1}{1-q^{-\|a_k\|}t^{|d(a_k)|(\pm1)}}=\sum_{\varsigma\in U_{|d(a_k)|}} c_i\left(\sum_{l=0}^{+\infty} q^{\frac{-\|a_k\|}{|d(a_k)|}l}\varsigma^l t^{\pm l}\right)$$

for some constants $c_i\in\mathbb{C}$. Note that $\pm l = l\left\{sgn(d\left(a_k\right))\right\}$. If $\frac{-\|a_i\|}{|d(a_i)|}\neq\frac{-\|a_j\|}{|d(a_j)|}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\left(1-q^{-\|a_i\|}t^{d(a_i)}\right)\left(1-q^{-\|a_j\|}t^{d(a_j)}\right)} &= \sum_{\varsigma\in U_{|d(a_i)|}} d_i\left(\sum_{l=0}^{+\infty} q^{\frac{-\|a_i\|}{|d(a_i)|}l}\varsigma^l t^{\pm l}\right) \\ &\quad+\sum_{\varsigma\in U_{|d(a_j)|}} h_j\left(\sum_{l=0}^{+\infty} q^{\frac{-\|a_j\|}{|d(a_j)|}l}\varsigma^l t^{\pm l}\right) \end{aligned}$$

for some constants $d_i,h_i\in\mathbb{C}$. If $\frac{-\|a_i\|}{|d(a_i)|}=\frac{-\|a_j\|}{|d(a_j)|}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\left(1-q^{-\|a_i\|}t^{d(a_i)}\right)\left(1-q^{-\|a_j\|}t^{d(a_j)}\right)} &= \sum_{\varsigma\in U_{|d(a_i)|}\cap U_{|d(a_j)|}}\left\{\frac{d_\varsigma}{\left(1-q^{\frac{-\|a_i\|}{|d(a_i)|}}\varsigma t^{\pm1}\right)^2}\right. \\ &\quad\left.+\frac{f_\varsigma}{1-q^{\frac{-\|a_i\|}{|d(a_i)|}}\varsigma t^{\pm1}}\right\}+\sum_{\substack{\varsigma\in U_{|d(a_i)|}\\ \varsigma\notin U_{|d(a_i)|}\cap U_{|d(a_j)|}}} g_\varsigma\left(\sum_{l=0}^{+\infty} q^{\frac{-\|a_i\|}{|d(a_i)|}l}\varsigma^l t^{\pm l}\right) \\ &\quad+\sum_{\substack{\varsigma\in U_{|d(aj)|}\\ \varsigma\notin U_{|d(a_i)|}\cap U_{|d(a_j)|}}} h_\varsigma\left(\sum_{l=0}^{+\infty} q^{\frac{-\|a_j\|}{|d(a_j)|}l}\varsigma^l t^{\pm l}\right) \end{aligned}$$

for some constants $d_\varsigma, f_\varsigma, g_\varsigma, h_\varsigma \in \mathbb{C}$. Note that

$$\frac{1}{\left(1-q^{\frac{-\|a_i\|}{|d(a_i)|}}\varsigma t^{\pm 1}\right)^2}=\sum_{l=0}^{+\infty}(l+1)\,q^{\frac{-\|a_i\|}{|d(a_i)|}l}\varsigma^l t^{\pm l}.$$

Therefore for m big enough,

$$V_m(f,\Phi)=\sum_\gamma c_m(\gamma,f)\,m^{\mu(\gamma)-1}q^{\gamma m} \tag{3.16}$$

where γ runs through of the poles of $Z_\Phi^{(1)}(s,\chi_{triv},f)$ such that $\operatorname{Re}(\gamma)\in B(\mathcal{F}_+)$, and $c(m,\gamma)$ are complex constants. The first part follows from (3.16) by Proposition 3. The second part is obtained in a similar form by using Proposition 2. $\square$

4. Oscillatory Integrals

In this section we extend Igusa's stationary phase method for p-adic oscillatory integrals ([**13**], [**14**], [**4**]) to the case of non-degenerate Laurent polynomials in two variables.

4.1. Additive characters.

Given

$$z=\sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty}z_np^n\in\mathbb{Q}_p,\text{ with } z_n\in\{0,\dots,p-1\}\text{ and } z_{n_0}\neq 0,$$

we set

$$\{z\}_p:=\begin{cases}0 & \text{if}\quad n_0\geq 0\\ \sum_{n=n_0}^{-1}z_np^n & \text{if}\quad n_0<0,\end{cases}$$

the fractional part of z. Then $\exp(2\pi\sqrt{-1}\{z\}_p)$, $z\in\mathbb{Q}_p$, is an additive character on $\mathbb{Q}_p$ trivial on $\mathbb{Z}_p$ but not on $p^{-1}\mathbb{Z}_p$.

We recall that there exists an integer $d\geq 0$ such that $Tr_{K/\mathbb{Q}_p}(z)\in\mathbb{Z}_p$ for $|z|_K\leq q^d$ but $Tr_{K/\mathbb{Q}_p}(z_0)\notin\mathbb{Z}_p$ for some z_0 with $|z_0|_K=q^{d+1}$. The integer d is called *the exponent of the different* of $K/\mathbb{Q}_p$. It is known that $d\geq e-1$, where e is the ramification index of $K/\mathbb{Q}_p$, see e.g. [**29**, Chap. VIII, Corollary of Proposition 1]. The additive character

$$\varkappa(z)=\exp(2\pi\sqrt{-1}\left\{Tr_{K/\mathbb{Q}_p}(\mathfrak{p}^{-d}z)\right\}_p),\ z\in K,$$

is *a standard character* of K, i.e. $\varkappa$ is trivial on R_K but not on P_K^{-1}. For our purposes, it is more convenient to use

$$\Psi(z)=\exp(2\pi\sqrt{-1}\left\{Tr_{K/\mathbb{Q}_p}(z)\right\}_p),\ z\in K,$$

instead of $\varkappa(\cdot)$. This particular choice is due to the fact that we use Denef's approach for estimating oscillatory integrals, see [**4**, Proposition 1.4.4].

4.2. Asymptotic expansion of oscillatory integrals. Given $\Phi \in S(R_K^2)$ and f a Laurent polynomial in two variables, as before, we set

$$E_{\Phi}^{(1)}(z, f) := E_{\Phi}^{(1)}(z) = \int\limits_{T^2(K)} \Phi(x)\,\Psi(zf(x))\,|dx|,$$

for $z = u\mathfrak{p}^{-m}$, with $u \in R_K^{\times}$, and $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. We call a such integral an *oscillatory integral*.

Let $\mathrm{Coeff}_{t^k} Z_{\Phi}^{(1)}(s, \chi, f)$ denote the coefficient c_k in the power expansion of $Z_{\Phi}^{(1)}(s, \chi, f)$ in the variable $t = q^{-s}$.

PROPOSITION 4. *Let f be a non-degenerate Laurent polynomial satisfying $C_f \subset f^{-1}(0)$. There exists a constant $e(\Phi) \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $Z_{\Phi}^{(1)}(s, \chi, f) = 0$ unless $c(\chi) \leq e(\Phi)$.*

PROOF. The proof follows from formulas (2.2)-(2.11) and Lemma 4, by using the same argument given by Igusa for Theorem 8.4.1 in [**14**]. □

PROPOSITION 5. *With the above notation,*

$$E_{\Phi}^{(1)}\left(u\mathfrak{p}^{-m}\right) = Z_{\Phi}^{(1)}(0, \chi_{triv}) + \mathit{Coeff}_{t^{m-1}} \frac{(t-q)\, Z_{\Phi}^{(1)}(s, \chi_{triv})}{(q-1)(1-t)} + \sum_{\chi \neq \chi_{triv}} g_{\chi^{-1}} \chi(u)\, \mathit{Coeff}_{t^{m-c(\chi)}} Z_{\Phi}^{(1)}(s, \chi),$$

where $c(\chi)$ denotes the conductor of χ, and g_{χ} denotes the Gaussian sum

$$g_{\chi} = (q-1)^{-1} q^{1-c(\chi)} \sum_{v \in \left(R_K/P_K^{c(\chi)}\right)^{\times}} \chi(v)\, \Psi\left(v/\mathfrak{p}^{c(\chi)}\right).$$

PROOF. The proof uses the same reasoning given by Denef for Proposition 1.4.4 in [**4**] and Lemma 8.1.2 in [**14**]. □

THEOREM 5. *Let f be a non-degenerate Laurent polynomial satisfying $C_f \subset f^{-1}(0)$. Let $\mathcal{F}_+$ be a simple fan subordinated to Γ_∞ and supported on $\mathbb{R}_+^2$.*
(i) If $B(\mathcal{F}_+) \neq \emptyset$, then for $|z|_K$ big enough $E_{\Phi}^{(1)}(z)$ has an asymptotic expansion as a finite $\mathbb{C}-$linear combination of the functions of the form $\chi(ac\ z)\,|z|_K^{\lambda} \left(\log_q |z|_K\right)^{j_\lambda}$ with coefficients independent of z, and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ a pole with negative real part of $\left(1 - q^{-s-1}\right) Z_{\Phi}^{(1)}(s, \chi_{triv})$ or of $Z_{\Phi}^{(1)}(s, \chi)$, $\chi \neq \chi_{triv}$, and with $j_\lambda \leq$(multiplicity of pole λ -1). Moreover all the poles λ, with negative real part, appear effectively in this linear combination.
(ii) If $B(\mathcal{F}_+) \neq \emptyset$ and $\beta_f \neq -1$, or $\beta_f = -1$ and $\mu(\beta_f) = 2$, then

$$\left|E_{\Phi}^{(1)}(z)\right| \leq C(K)\, |z|_K^{\beta_f} \left(\log_q |z|_K\right)^{\mu(\beta_f)-1},$$

for $|z|_K$ big enough, where $C(K)$ is a positive constant.
(iii) If $A(\mathcal{F}_+) \neq \emptyset$, then for $|z|_K$ small enough $E_{\Phi}^{(1)}(z) - Z_{\Phi}^{(1)}(0, \chi_{triv})$ has an asymptotic expansion as a finite $\mathbb{C}-$linear combination of the functions of the form $\chi(ac\ z)\,|z|_K^{\lambda} \left(\log_q |z|_K\right)^{j_\lambda}$ with coefficients independent of z, and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ a pole with positive real part of $\left(1 - q^{-s-1}\right) Z_{\Phi}^{(1)}(s, \chi_{triv})$ or of $Z_{\Phi}^{(1)}(s, \chi)$, $\chi \neq \chi_{triv}$, and with

$j_\lambda \leq$(multiplicity of pole λ -1). Moreover all the poles λ, with positive real part, appear effectively in this linear combination.
(iv) If $A(\mathcal{F}_+) \neq \emptyset$, then

$$\left| E_\Phi^{(1)}(z) - Z_\Phi^{(1)}(0, \chi_{triv}) \right| \leq C(K) \left| z \right|_K^{\alpha_{\max}} \left(\log_q \left| z \right|_K \right),$$

for $|z|_K$ small enough, where $C(K)$ is a positive constant and $\alpha_{\max} = \max_{\gamma \in A(\mathcal{F}_+)} \gamma$.

Proof. (i) and (iii) The results follow from Theorem 1 and Propositions 5-4 by writing $Z_\Phi^{(1)}(s,\chi)$ in partial fractions as in the proof of Theorem 4. (ii) The estimation follows from (i) and Proposition 3. (iv) The estimation follows from (iii) and Proposition 2. □

In general $E_\Phi^{(1)}(z,f)$ cannot be expressed as a finite sum of exponential sums mod $\mathfrak{p}^m$. Under additional hypotheses $E_\Phi^{(1)}(z,f)$ becomes an exponential sum mod $\mathfrak{p}^m$ as shows the following result.

Corollary 1. *Let $f_0(x) = \frac{\widehat{f}_0(x)}{x_1^{d_1}}$, $f_1(x) = \frac{\widehat{f}_1(x)}{x_2^{d_2}}$ be non-degenerate Laurent polynomials. Set $A_m^{(0)} = R_K^\times / P_K^m \times R_K / P_K^m$, $A_m^{(1)} = R_K / P_K^m \times R_K^\times / P_K^m$ and*

$$S_m(f_i) := q^{-2m} \sum_{x \in A_m^{(i)}} \Psi(zf(x)),$$

where $z = u\mathfrak{p}^{-m}$, with $u \in R_K^\times$ and $m \geq 1$. Then, for m big enough,

$$|S_m(f_i)| \leq C(f_i)\, m^{\mu\left(\beta_{f_i}\right)-1} q^{\beta_{f_i} m}.$$

Proof. By taking Φ to be the characteristic function of $R_K^\times \times R_K$ and $R_K \times R_K^\times$, we obtain $E_\Phi^{(1)}(z,f_i) = S_m(f_i)$, $i = 0,1$. Now the result follows from Theorem 5. □

5. Explicit Formulas

Let $L \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ be a number field, and let A_L be its ring of integers. Take a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{P}$ of A_L, and denote by $K := K_{\mathfrak{P}}$ the completion of L with respect to the $\mathfrak{P}$-adic valuation. Denote by $\mathbb{F}_q$ the residue field of $\mathfrak{P}$. We will use all the notation for p-adic fields introduced in Section 3.

Let $f(x) \in A_L\left[x_1, x_2, x_1^{-1}, x_2^{-1}\right]$ be a non-constant Laurent polynomial, which is non-degenerate with respect to Γ_∞ over $\mathbb{C}$. Then, by the Weak Nullstellensatz, for almost all $\mathfrak{P}$, i.e. for q big enough, the system of equations

$$\left\{ \; f_\tau(x) = 0, \quad \nabla f_\tau(x) = 0 \; \right\} \tag{5.1}$$

has no solutions in $\left(R_K^\times\right)^2$, for any face τ of Γ_∞. If we denote by $\overline{f}$ the reduction modulo $\mathfrak{P}$ of f, by the Hensel Lemma, condition (5.1) is equivalent to the following: the system of equations

$$\left\{ \; \overline{f_\tau}(x) = 0, \quad \nabla \overline{f_\tau}(x) = 0 \; \right\} \tag{5.2}$$

has no solutions in $\left(\mathbb{F}_q^\times\right)^2$, for any face τ of Γ_∞. In this case, we will say *that f* (or that $\overline{f}$) *is non-degenerate with respect to* Γ_∞ *over* $\mathbb{F}_q$.

Lemma 5. *Let f be a non-degenerate Laurent polynomial with respect to Γ_∞ over $\mathbb{F}_q$, such that $f_\tau(x) = \frac{\widehat{f}_\tau(x)}{\prod_{i\in I(\tau)} x_i^{d_i}}$. For any face τ of Γ_∞, the two following assertions are equivalent:*
(i) the system of equations $\{f_\tau(x) = 0, \nabla f_\tau(x) = 0\}$ has no solutions in $\left(R_K^\times\right)^2$;
(ii) the system of equations $\left\{\widehat{f}_\tau(x) = 0, \nabla \widehat{f}_\tau(x) = 0\right\}$ has no solutions in $\left(R_K^\times\right)^2$.

Proof. The equivalence follows from the following calculation:

$$\frac{\partial \widehat{f}_\tau}{\partial x_j}(x) = \begin{cases} \left(\prod_{i\in I(\tau)} x_i^{d_i}\right) \frac{\partial f_\tau}{\partial x_j}(x), & \text{if} \quad j \notin I(\tau) \\ \\ \frac{d_j}{x_j}\left(\prod_{i\in I(\tau)} x_i^{d_i}\right) f_\tau(x) + \left(\prod_{i\in I(\tau)} x_i^{d_i}\right) \frac{\partial f_\tau}{\partial x_j}(x), & \text{if} \quad j \in I(\tau). \end{cases}$$

Since q is big enough, we have $\overline{d_j} \neq 0$, for any j. □

Remark 6. *Let $g \in R_K\left[x_1, x_2, x_1^{-1}, x_2^{-1}\right]$ be a non-constant Laurent polynomial satisfying (i) $\overline{g} \in \mathbb{F}_q\left[x_1, x_2, x_1^{-1}, x_2^{-1}\right] \smallsetminus \mathbb{F}_q$ and (ii) the system of equations $\{\overline{g}(x) = 0, \nabla \overline{g}(x) = 0\}$ has no solutions in $\left(\mathbb{F}_q^\times\right)^2$. Then*

$$\int\limits_{\left(R_K^\times\right)^2} |g(x)|_K^s \, |dx| = q^{-2}\left\{q^2 - 1 + N\left(\frac{q^{-s}-1}{1-q^{-s-1}}\right)\right\}, \text{ for } \operatorname{Re}(s) > 0,$$

where $N := Card\left(\left\{x \in \left(\mathbb{F}_q^\times\right)^2 ; \overline{g}(x) = 0\right\}\right)$.

The formula follows from Lemma 5 by using the Stationary Phase Formula, see [**14**, Theorem 10.2.1].

Lemma 6. *Let f be a non-degenerate Laurent polynomial with respect to Γ_∞ over $\mathbb{F}_q$. For a face τ of Γ_∞, set*

$$\begin{aligned} g(x,\tau) &:= f_\tau(x) + \sum_{\substack{m \notin \tau \\ m \in supp(f)}} \mathfrak{p}^{l_m} c_m x^m \\ &= f_\tau(x) + \mathfrak{p}^{l_0'} h(x), \end{aligned}$$

where $l_0' > 0$, and $l_m \geq 0$ for every m. Then

$$\int\limits_{\left(R_K^\times\right)^2} |g(x,\tau)|_K^s \, |dx| = q^{-2}\left\{q^2 - 1 + N_\tau\left(\frac{q^{-s}-1}{1-q^{-s-1}}\right)\right\}, \text{ for } \operatorname{Re}(s) > 0,$$

where $N_\tau := Card\left(\left\{x \in \left(\mathbb{F}_q^\times\right)^2 ; \overline{f_\tau}(x) = 0\right\}\right)$.

Proof. Since $\bar{g} = \bar{f}_\tau$, we have $\{\bar{g}(x) = 0, \nabla\bar{g}(x) = 0\} = \{\bar{f}_\tau(x) = 0, \nabla\bar{f}_\tau(x) = 0\}$. From the non-degeneracy condition, the later system of equations has no solutions in $(\mathbb{F}_q^\times)^2$, therefore, the hypotheses of Remark 6 hold and

$$\int\limits_{\left(R_K^\times\right)^2} |g(x,\tau)|_K^s \, |dx| = q^{-2}\left\{q^2 - 1 + N\left(\frac{q^{-s}-1}{1-q^{-s-1}}\right)\right\}, \text{ for } \operatorname{Re}(s) > 0$$

with $N = N_\tau$. □

Set

$$Z^{(1)}(s,f) := \int\limits_{(R_K\smallsetminus\{0\})^2} |f(x)|_K^s \, |dx| \text{ for } \beta_f < \operatorname{Re}(s) < \alpha_f .$$

Theorem 6. *Let f be a Laurent polynomial in two variables which is non-degenerate with respect to Γ_∞ over $\mathbb{F}_q$. Let $\{\Delta_\tau\}_{\tau\in\mathcal{A}}$ be a simplicial polyhedral subdivision of $\mathbb{R}_+^2$ subordinated to Γ_∞. Denote for each attainable face τ of Γ_∞,*

$$N_\tau = \left\{ x \in \left(\mathbb{F}_q^\times\right)^2 ; \overline{f_\tau}(x) = 0 \right\}.$$

For Δ_τ with $\tau\in\mathcal{A}$, denote by a_j, $j=1, r_{\Delta_\tau}$, the edges (generators) of the cone Δ_τ. Then

$$Z^{(1)}(s,f) = L_{\Gamma_\infty}\left(q^{-s}\right) + \sum_{\tau\in\mathcal{A}} L_\tau\left(q^{-s}\right) S_\tau\left(q^{-s}\right).$$

Here

$$L_\tau\left(q^{-s}\right) = q^{-2}\left((q-1)^2 - \frac{N_\tau\left(1-q^{-s}\right)}{1-q^{-s-1}}\right),$$

for $\tau\in\mathcal{A}$, and

$$S_\tau\left(q^{-s}\right) = \frac{\left(\sum\limits_h q^{\|h\|+d(h)s}\right) q^{-\sum_{j=1}^{r_{\Delta_\tau}}\left(\|a_j\|+d(a_j)s\right)}}{\prod\limits_{j=1}^{r_{\Delta_\tau}}\left(1-q^{-\|a_j\|-d(a_j)s}\right)},$$

where h runs through the elements of the set

$$\mathbb{Z}^2 \cap \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{r_{\Delta_\tau}} \lambda_j a_j ; 0 \leq \lambda_j < 1 \text{ for } j = 1, r_{\Delta_\tau} \right\}.$$

Proof. The proof follows from Lemma 6, by using the same reasoning given in [**6**, Theorem 4.2] for the case $f(x)\in R_K[x_1,\cdots,x_n]$. Note that there may be $\tau\in\mathcal{A}$ for which $\overline{\Delta}_\tau = \left\{a\in\mathbb{R}^2; F(a)\supset\tau\right\}$, cf. Lemma 1. ☐

By using a simple polyhedral subdivision one obtains a slightly less complicated explicit formula in which all the terms $\sum_h q^{\|h\|+d(h)s}$ are identically 1. But then in general we have to introduce new rays which give rise to superfluous candidate poles.

Example 3. *Set $g(x,y) = x^{-3}+y^{-2}+y^4 \in \mathbb{Z}[x,y]$. This polynomial is non-degenerate with respect to $\Gamma_\infty(g)$ over $\mathbb{F}_q$, for q big enough. The Newton polytope $\Gamma_\infty(g)$ has three facets:*

$$\tau_1 = \left\{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathbb{R}^2; 4\alpha-3\beta=-12, -3\leq\alpha\leq 0\right\},$$
$$\tau_2 = \left\{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathbb{R}^2; 2\alpha+3\beta=-6, -3\leq\alpha\leq 0\right\},$$
$$\tau_3 = \left\{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathbb{R}^2; -\alpha=0, -2\leq\beta\leq 4\right\},$$

and three vertices: $\gamma_1=(-3,0)$, $\gamma_2=(0,-2)$,$\gamma_3=(0,4)$. Then the vectors $\{(-1,0),(2,3),(4,-3)\}$ are the edges of a simplicial polyhedral subdivision of $\mathbb{R}^2$ subordinated to $\Gamma_\infty(g)$, and the vectors $\{(1,0),(2,3),(1,0)\}$ are the edges of a non-trivial simplicial polyhedral subdivision of $\mathbb{R}_+^2$ subordinated to $\Gamma_\infty(g)$. The data required in the explicit formula for $Z^{(1)}(s,g)$ are the following:

$$L_{\Gamma_\infty}\left(q^{-s}\right) = q^{-2}\left\{q^2 - 1 + N_{\Gamma_\infty}\left(\frac{q^{-s}-1}{1-q^{-s-1}}\right)\right\},$$

with $N_{\Gamma_\infty} = \left\{(x,y) \in \left(\mathbb{F}_q^\times\right)^2 ;\, x^{-3} + y^{-2} + y^4 = 0\right\}$, *and*

Cone Generators	τ	$L_\tau\left(q^{-s}\right)$	$S_\tau\left(q^{-s}\right)$
$(0,1)$	$\{(0,-2)\}$	$\left(1-q^{-1}\right)^2$	$\frac{q^{-1+2s}}{1-q^{-1+2s}}$
$(2,3)$	τ_2	$q^{-2}\{q^2-1+ N_{\tau_2}\left(\frac{q^{-s}-1}{1-q^{-s-1}}\right)\}$	$\frac{q^{-5+6s}}{1-q^{-5+6s}}$
$(1,0)$	$\{(-3,0)\}$	$\left(1-q^{-1}\right)^2$	$\frac{q^{-1+3s}}{1-q^{-1+3s}}$
$(0,1),(2,3)$	$\{(0,-2)\}$	$\left(1-q^{-1}\right)^2$	$\frac{q^{-3+4s}\left(1+q^{-3+4s}\right)}{\left(1-q^{-1+2s}\right)\left(1-q^{-5+6s}\right)}$
$(2,3),(1,0)$	$\{(-3,0)\}$	$\left(1-q^{-1}\right)^2$	$\frac{q^{-2+3s}\left(1+q^{-2+3s}+q^{-4+6s}\right)}{\left(1-q^{-1+3s}\right)\left(1-q^{-5+6s}\right)}$

where $N_{\tau_2} = Card\left(\left\{(x,y) \in \left(\mathbb{F}_q^\times\right)^2 ; x^3 + y^2 = 0\right\}\right)$. *Then the real parts of the poles of* $Z(s,g)$ *belong to* $\left\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{5}{6}, -1\right\}$. *In addition,* $\left\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{5}{6}\right\}$ *are actually poles of* $Z^{(1)}(s,g)$. *Note that only the poles* $\frac{5}{6} + \frac{2\pi\sqrt{-1}\mathbb{Z}}{6\log q}$ *come from the equation of a supporting plane, more precisely from* τ_2. *Finally, note that* $\beta = \frac{1}{3}$, *and that this datum does not come from the equations of the supporting planes of* $\Gamma_\infty(g)$.

References

[1] Adolphson Alan and Sperber Steven, Exponential sums and Newton polyhedra, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) 16 (1987), 282–286.

[2] Adolphson Alan and Sperber Steven,Exponential sums and Newton polyhedra: cohomology and estimates, Ann. of Math. (2) 130 (1989), 367–406.

[3] Arnold V. I., Gussein-Zade S. M., Varchenko A. N., Singularités des applications différentiables, Vol II, Éditions Mir, Moscou, 1986.

[4] Denef J., Report on Igusa's Local Zeta Function, Séminaire Bourbaki 43 (1990-1991), exp. 741; Astérisque 201-202-203 (1991), 359-386. Available at http://www.wis.kuleuven.ac.be/algebra/denef.html.

[5] Denef J., Poles of p-adic complex powers and Newton polyhedra, Nieuw. Arch. Wisk. 13 (1995), 289-295.

[6] Denef J. and Hoornaert K., Newton polyhedra and Igusa's local zeta function, J. Number Theory 89 (2001), 31-64.

[7] Denef J. and Loeser, F,Weights of exponential sums, intersection cohomology, and Newton polyhedra, Invent. Math. 106 (1991), no. 2, 275–294.

[8] Denef J. and Sargos P., Polyèdre de Newton et distribution f_+^s. I, J. Analyse Math., 53 (1989), 201–218.

[9] Denef J., Sperber S., Exponential sums mod p^n and Newton polyhedra. A tribute to Maurice Boffa.Bull. Belg. Math. Soc. Simon Stevin 2001, suppl., 55–63.

[10] Ewald Günter, Combinatorial convexity and algebraic geometry. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 168. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996.

[11] Fulton William, Introduction to toric varieties. Annals of Mathematics Studies, 131. The William H. Roever Lectures in Geometry. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993.

[12] Hironaka H., Resolution of singularities of an algebraic variety over a field of characteristic zero, Ann. of Math. (2) 79 (1964), 109–203.

[13] Igusa J-Ii, Forms of higher degree, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research Lectures on Mathematics and Physics, 59. Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Bombay; by the Narosa Publishing House, New Delhi, 1978.

[14] Igusa J.-I., An introduction to the theory of local zeta functions, AMS/IP Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 2000.

[15] Igusa J-I., Some aspects of the arithmetic theory of polynomials. Discrete groups in geometry and analysis (New Haven, Conn., 1984), 20–47, Progr. Math., 67, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1987.

[16] Kempf G., Knudsen F., Mumford D., Saint-Donat B., Toroidal embeddings, Lectures notes in Mathematics vol. 339, Springer-Verlag, 1973.

[17] Khovanskii A. G., Newton polyhedra, and toroidal varieties, Functional Anal. Appl. 11 (1977), no. 4, 289–296 (1978).

[18] Khovanskii A. G., Newton polyhedra (resolution of singularities). (Russian) Current problems in mathematics, Vol. 22, 207–239, Itogi Nauki i Tekhniki, Akad. Nauk SSSR, Vsesoyuz. Inst. Nauchn. i Tekhn. Inform., Moscow, 1983.

[19] Lichtin Ben, Meuser Diane, Poles of a local zeta function and Newton polygons, Compositio Math. 55 (1985), no. 3, 313–332.

[20] Loeser F., Fonctions zêta locales d'Igusa à plusieurs variables, intégration dans les fibres, et discriminants, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) 22 (1989), no. 3, 435–471.

[21] Oka, Mutsuo, Non-degenerate Complete Intersection Singularity. Actualités Mathématiques. [Current Mathematical Topics] Hermann, Paris, 1997.

[22] Rockafellar R. Tyrrell, Convex analysis. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1997.

[23] Serre Jean-Pierre, Lie Algebras and Lie Groups. W. A. Benjamin, Inc., New York, Amsterdam, 1968.

[24] Schrijver Alexander, Theory of linear and integer programming. Wiley-Interscience Series in Discrete Mathematics. A Wiley-Interscience Publication. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, 1986.

[25] Sturmfels Bernd, Gröbner bases and convex polytopes. University Lecture Series, 8. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1996.

[26] Varchenko A., Newton polyhedra and estimation of oscillating integrals, Funct. Anal. Appl. 10 (1976), 175-196.

[27] Varchenko A. N., Zeta-function of monodromy and Newton's diagram, Invent. Math. 37 (1976), no. 3, 253–262.

[28] Veys Willem, Zúñiga-Galindo, W. A., Zeta functions for analytic mappings, log-principalization of ideals, and Newton polyhedra, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 360 (2008), no. 4, 2205–2227.

[29] Weil A., Basic Number Theory, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1967.

[30] Ziegler Günter M., Lectures on polytopes. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 152. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994.

[31] Zuniga-Galindo W.A., Local zeta functions and Newton polyhedra, Nagoya Math. J., 172 (2003), 31-58.

[32] Zúñiga-Galindo W. A., Local zeta functions supported on analytic submanifolds and Newton polyhedra, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN 2009, no. 15, 2855–2898.

Centro de Investigación y de Estudios Avanzados del Instituto Politécnico Nacional, Departamento de Matemáticas- Unidad Querétaro, Libramiento Norponiente #2000, Fracc. Real de Juriquilla. Santiago de Querétaro, Qro. 76230, México.

E-mail address: `eleon@math.cinvestav.mx`

Centro de Investigación y de Estudios Avanzados del Instituto Politécnico Nacional, Departamento de Matemáticas- Unidad Querétaro, Libramiento Norponiente #2000, Fracc. Real de Juriquilla. Santiago de Querétaro, Qro. 76230, México

E-mail address: `wazuniga@math.cinvestav.edu.mx`